

TH DEN POR

TERMS-\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy.

THE

# Lutheran Quarterly

CONDUCTED BY

JAS. W. RICHARD, D. D., LL. D. J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D. FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

PROF. S. A. ORT, D. D., LL. D.
PROF. ALFRED HILLER, D. D.
PROF. J. L. NEVE, D. D.

VOL. XXXIX-NO. 2.

APRIL. 1909.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-cless matter.

GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPULER PRINT

### CONTENTS.

I.	WUNDT'S THEORY OF THE SOUL
п.	"GOD BETWEEN FOUR WALLS."
III.	FREEDOM OF TEACHING
IV.	PREACHING CHRIST CRUCIFIED
٧.	GOD'S FELLOW-WORKERS IN THE MINISTRY 236 BY PROFESSOR DAVID B. FLOYD, D.D.
VI.	RECENT GERMAN RESEARCH CONCERNING LU- THER
VII.	SOME NEW LIGHT CONCERNING THE SCHWABACH ARTICLES
VIII.	BENEFICIARY EDUCATION IN THE GENERAL SYNOD 268  BY REV. O. B. GRUVER.
IX.	SOCIOLOGY AND THE PULPIT
	REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE

The Precinct of Religion—The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Infe—India: Its Life and Thought—The Bible for Home and School—The World's Great Sermons—The Logical and Historical Inacturacies of the Hon. Bourke Cockran—Lincoln's Use of the Bible—The New Horoscope of Missions—The Heroes and Crisis of Early Hebrew History—The Founders and Rulers of United Israel.

## THE

# LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1909.

#### ARTICLE I.

WUNDT'S THEORY OF THE SOUL.



BY PROFESSOR C. F. SANDERS, M.A., B.D.

In addressing ourselves to a topic such as this we are attempting to discover what real light a great thinker has brought to a problem which has ever been of the highest interest to human kind. The "quiddity" of things is what constitutes knowledge. The pre-Socratics concerned themselves wholly with the whence and what of the universe; Socrates and Plato directed their thought to man. Why? Because their predecessors, dealing with things extraneous to man, things of which we get knowledge through the senses, had culminated their theory of knowledge in an absolute scepticism. The subjectivity-relativity-of sense-perception failed to give a fixed ground of certainty. Man. however, is characterized by moral criteria. The ultimate criterion, the Good, is fixed. Participation in the absolute Good is what man values above all else. But the Good is ideal, spiritual; apprehended intellectually, and removed from the changeful realm of sense. It follows at once that the what in which this character inheres, is a spiritual entity. The soul is the reality we call man in Socratic-Platonic philosophy. But Aristotle could not satisfy his mind with the Socratic thesis: "To know the good is to do it. Evil is ignorance." In order to correct the paradox into which Socrates had fallen by his conceptual method, Aristotle appeals to experience,-all the world knows that experience contradicts Socrates' proposition. Thus the method is reversed once more. In experience the only realities which appear are actualities. We are never aware of any spiritual entity in puris. Thus the reality of a distinct soul-essence is banished once more. This rapid sketch gives the range within which thought on this subject has moved during twenty-four centuries. The idealist and intellectualist have maintained someform of the Socratic contention, the realist and empiricist have ever stood nearer Aristotle. Our age is severely scientific, empirical, hence stands close to Aristotle.

Wundt approaches the problem of the soul by the physiological path. He began professional study in medicine, and forsooth as a specialist in nervous diseases. His transition to psychology is natural enough—for nervous diseases are perhaps more readily treated through mind than physiologically. Taking up the psychological problem where Fechner had laid it down—Fechner had concluded that the soul and the body are identical, with but two series of manifestation(1)—he was of course-launched in the empirical trend. He differs with Fechner in regarding psychophysical parallelism as an empirical fact(2) rather than as a metaphysical conclusion; hence he does not accept the identity theory—which is metaphysical.

'The psychologists of half a century ago were accustomed to start with a definition of the soul. That may be justified if we are satisfied with the metaphysical method. Modern scientific psychology deals with the facts of consciousness as it finds them in experience, and either makes no attempt to define the soul, or relegates it to a descriptive chapter at the end of the treatise.

At the beginning of his chapter on The Concept of the Soul(3) Wundt sets the alternative extremes which he seeks to

<sup>(1)</sup> Fechner came to this conclusion in seeking to apply Weber's Law to the determination of psychical phenomena. This identity theory, by which the distinctly psychical fades into the psychophysical—a modern name for the old Greek hylozoism—is thus the product of radical empiricism.

<sup>(2)</sup> See Villa, Contemporary Psychology p. 126. Wundt, Physiologischen Psychologie 5 III, 773. "Our criterion is not what some metaphysical hypothesis commends to belief, but subjective observation offers as really given."

<sup>(3)</sup> Phys. Psyc.5 III, 756-794. This chapter, along with a section in his Logik III, pp. 241-250, a section of his System der Philosophie 2 pp. 364-383, and an article in Vol. X, of Philosophische Studien, on Psychical Causality, contain Wundt's presentation of the subject. A very brief account may befound in his Outlines of Psychology pp. 352-364 (First English Edition).

avoid. "In the absolutely infinite Substance of Spinoza personality fades as an evanescent Mode of Being, and the simple soul of Herbart is an empty concept, just as soon as its coexistence with the simple substance of its body ceases. Thus these logically most correct forms of the philosophical concept both lead to its dissolution. Substance in them has passed out of the real world into one that is super-real." A super-reality is no better for us than an unreality. Wundt wants to give us a concept which cannot escape into the unreal. "Inasmuch as the psychology of today has undertaken to construe the reality of psychical life, not on the basis of superficial generalizations, but to analyse all of its phenomena and so far as possible with the help of exact methods, naturally it cannot use any other soul concept, save that the soul is nothing more than the psychical event. This is in nowise a new soul concept which it thus uses, but the same which has really (in Grunde) always been used when men tried somehow or other to get nearer to psychical facts."(4) This is his description of the "actual" soul of psychology, the only soul which the psychologist knows.

When he proceeds to explain this actuality under the relation of body and soul he warns against confusing the standpoint of practical experience and that of the scientific analysis of phenomena. Scientific analysis, in giving profounder insight, continually modifies the viewpoint of practical experience. Science cannot conflict with practical experience, for practical experience rests on transient opinion rather than on fact. When there is seeming disagreement it is practical experience that is in error. Hence the viewpoint of practical experience falls away, being nothing more than one of the phenomena with which science deals. Furthermore, practical experience always regards the soul and body as belonging together. (5) When scientific inves-

<sup>(4)</sup> Phys. Psyc. III, 761. See also Outlines, p. 356.

<sup>(5)</sup> In his Volkerpsychologie he draws a comparison between the "Volks-seele" and individual soul. Just as we find nothing more in race development than the coherent psychic processes—no substrate—so in individual psychology we discover only actual processes. "For empirical psychology the soul can never be more than that which is really given in psychical experience, nothing additional thereto either from without or within. From all this it follows that the concept soul can have no other significance than the coherence of the immediate facts of our consciousness, or as we for the sake of brevity prefer to call it, the "psychical processes." Sprache, Erster Theil, p. 9.

tigation, however, abstracting from the given experiences, dichotomizes body and soul it makes a distinction which it cannot carry out, "just because the real unity of body and soul presents an insurmountable obstacle." (6) "There are no objects, called bodies, alongside others, called minds, after the analogy of plants and animals." (7) "Body and soul form a unit, but they are not identical; they are not the same, but they are attributes of living beings which belong together." (8) "Soul and body are not different in themselves, but only in our conception." (9)

We must here come to some understanding of the differences and relation existing between science and metaphysics. We shall presently see that Wundt's soul concept is intended to be only scientific. Metaphysics takes the facts of science, and, working them into a system, interprets their real nature. Science does not concern itself with such interpretation beyond the given facts. The metaphysician contends that he is explaining the realities underlying the phenomena with which science deals. Mach, on the contrary, contends that reality is directly apprehensible through sense-perception, and that metaphysics is only apparently a science. "Haeckel, Mach and Ostwald are radical anti-metaphysicians, but at the same time the world-theory of each is essentially a metaphysics."(10) In stating his attitude to metaphysics, Wundt sets forth two possibilities. either to regard it "the mere appearance of science," with Mach, or to keep our positive (scientific) knowledge aloof from it. The latter he gives as his own position. (10)

The unit soul and body, he would regard only as it is actually

<sup>(6)</sup> Phys. Psyc. III, 764. We shall see later that if "because of an insurmountable" obstacle is to furnish a valid middle term, we have the same middle term from which to conclude the directly opposite. Certainly an "insurmountable obstacle" only justifies the inference to our ignorance, never to scientific knowledge. Liebmann, discussing the problem of Life comes finally to say, "Indeed, the origin of man in the womb, of a bird or amphibian in the egg has as its causa occasionalis; the act of generation and conception, as its real ground: I know not what. Here our wisdom is at an end." Analysis der Wirklichkeit. 3 Aufl. 354. The case is analogous.

<sup>(7)</sup> Phys. Psyc. III, 764.

<sup>(8)</sup> Phys. Psyc. III, 768. Attributes only.

<sup>(9)</sup> System d. Phil. 379. See also Logik III, 248 ff.

<sup>(10)</sup> Die Cultur der Gegenwart, Vol. I, Die Systematische Philosophie, Art. Metaphysik, p. 131 f.

given in experience. He would so regard it for the purpose of understanding the chain of events which take place in the psyshophysical being. Hence he would call it only a heuristic principle. As heuristic principle it would be non-committal on metaphysical questions. "Parallelism, as heuristic principle has nothing whatever to do with any such super-real background of the phenomenal world"(11) (as the transcendant hypotheses of distinct substances, spirit and matter). He rejects metaphysical parallelism because "it is bound to the substance hypothesis;" "it cannot be demonstrated empirically in any manner which will furnish ground for interpreting experience;" and "it leads by an inner necessity to a metaphysical psychology." (12)

The problem at issue is the old one, which was perceived already by Anaxagoras when he postulated a Nous as essential to the explanation of the universe. Descartes formulated the definitions by which the universe was cleft in twain. His definition of spirit as non-extended thinking substance, and of matter as extended substance, seemed simple, but their interaction or even coincidence, according to the definitions, was unexplainable. Parallelism is the attempt to bridge this gap-a metaphysical gap. It is well to observe whether or not there is something in the fact that the anti-metaphysicians referred to in footnote 10 are metaphysical in spite of themselves. It is pertinent to inquire whether explanation (science for mere description is scarcely science) does not demand metaphysics. Furthermore, perhaps. Wundt places himself under the same paradox with which he charges Haeckel, Mach and Ostwald. After all has been said about processes, physical, psychical and psycho-physical, so long as the question of causation has not been explained, nothing has been explained, and here men trench upon metaphysical ground protesting against metaphysics. (13)

The reasons why a non-interacting parallelism is postulated are grounded in the problem of causation. 1. "Every application of the principle of causality logically demands..... that

<sup>(11)</sup> Phys. Psyc. III, 772.

<sup>(12)</sup> Phys. Psyc. III, 772. See Villa, Contemporary Psyc. 329.

<sup>(13)</sup> Sigwart, Logik II, 749 f. also p. 134 f.; Venn, Empirical Logic, 47 ff.; Lotz, Metaphysics, II, 187 f.; Ladd, Theory of Reality, 261 f., 411 ff.

like can only be derived from like." 2. "According to natural science the principle of a closed circle of natural causality includes the requirement, that no physical process can be derived. from a psychical and no psychical from a physical..... 3. According to psychology an interpretation of psychical experiences cannot be given except by psychological methods."(14) These logical laws are sufficiently dualistic for even a Descartes. Wundt is emphatic in his declarations against materialism. But his parallelism commits him to a pantheistic conception in which the psychical individual is lost in the whole. The psychical parallel which lies over against the physical has no substantial reality. The substrate of consciousness is not the psyche, but the psychophysical being. Hence the psychical resolves itself into a quality, ineradicable and indestructible, of vital matter.-Thus the seeming dualism is obliterated by denying essential existence to the psyche.

This law of the closed circle of physical causation, first propounded by Meyer (1842) and Joule (1843), is a generalization from facts observed in physical science. It has been found to hold good within a limited realm of inorganic nature. That it must apply as a universal law of matter to the exclusion of the interaction of mind is wholly unwarranted.(15) This is the

<sup>(14)</sup> Logik, III, 253 f. See also Human and Animal Psychology, 442. System d. Philosophie, 598 f.

<sup>(15)</sup> Ladd, Elements Phys. Psyc. says: "The various forms of physical energy in the inorganic world are as yet by no means reducible to the terms of this law." "No mathematical formula, or picture framed by the imagination, has thus far bridged over the gap between the molecular energy of inorganic and organic structures." Further, Sigwart Logik, II, 534 f. "The absence of exact knowledge does not prevent us from making the general assumption that a causal relation (between mind and body) does nevertheless exist; and the principle of the conservation of energy is overstrained if it is taken as prohibiting this assumption. .... The principle states only that if, and in so far as, material masses act upon each other an equation will exist between the power of the work of the preceding state and that of the succeeding state.... The truth of the principle within a closed circle of constant material causes does not justify the inference that material things must, under all circumstances form a circle closed on all sides." See Wundt System 594. For ordinary consciousness the connection between my will and the motion of my arm is just as intuitable, i. e., just as firmly grounded in immediate experience and association, as the transmission of a shock from one billiardball to another." Ibid. p. 569. "Hardliy since her first beginnings has any school of philosophy been guilty of such rash and airy speculations, and trifled so with difficulties, as in hoping to reduce the whole complex of thought and will to chemical and physical events." Also, Bradley, Appearance and Re-

storm center of the New Psychology's' persistent purpose to reduce psychology to an exact science. It refuses the materialistic view which would regard mind as a phenomenon resulting from molecular activity, and, in order to maintain the scientific contention, makes of the psychical process a mere qualitative concomitance.

Wundt speaks of a distinct psychical causality. It is, however, not real, as inhering in a distinct substrate, but only actual as manifest in the given process. "Is there a psychical causality with characteristic laws of its own, or not? The investigations of the preceding section have everywhere answered this question with an emphatic affirmative." (16) Now what is it that is explainable only by reference to psychical causality? At the foundation of the consciousness we have a combination of elements which is more than a mere sum of those elements. Whence this It is the result of a creative synthesis performed by mind. "Let us call this fundamental attribute of psychical processes the principle of creative resultants."(17) This principle operates by relativity and contrast. Inasmuch as it is creative. it accounts for development. The law of "increase of psychic energy" follows logically from the law of resultants. He sets the law of increase of psychical energy alongside the physical law of the conservation of energy. And then he finds a further psychical law which he calls the law of the heterogony of ends. These laws, creative synthesis, increase of psychic energy, and heterogony of ends account for the evolution of history. The actual soul furnishes the facts from which we discover these laws. He thus at the same time confines psychology to the facts given in the world of experience and extends it over the whole realm of

ality; 324. "We may be sure, that no one, except to save a theory, would deny that in volition mind influences matter." And Lotze, Metaphysics II, 187. "Admitting this incomparability, (between soul and body) it would be an unfounded prejudice to suppose that only like can act on like, and a mistake to imagine that the case of an interaction of soul and body is an exceptional one, and that we are here to find inexplicable what in any action of matter upon matter we understand." p. 190, "the soul is not parted from sensuous things by the gulf of that incomparability which is supposed to be a bar to all interaction."

<sup>(16)</sup> Phys. Psyc. III, 777 f.

<sup>(17)</sup> Ibid. p. 778. Villa, Contem. Psyc. 351 ff. Wundt, Outlines of Psychol. 364 ff.

psychic phenomena. "Psychology is the knowledge of mental life in the totality of its development from the obscure motions of individual souls in the beginnings of their existence upward through the successive stages of individual states of consciousness even to the highest mental activities in society and history." (18)

It must not be forgotten, however, that this psychical causality, so wholly unexplainable by physical principles, can never be divorced from the physical in combination with which it is given in experience. (19)

The psychological principle of parallelism thus furnishes a bridge over the Cartesian gap. There is concomitance instead of interaction. The respective lines of this parallelism have their own distinct form of energy. If psychology would be scientific it must not go beyond this parallelism as it is given in experience. In doing so, as noted above, the scientific psychologist disclaims any metaphysical pronouncement. He adopts parallelism as heuristic principle in the scientific psychology.

Now we come to ask what it is that this scientist would have us think of the essence in which his heuristic principle inheres and within which it acts. The actual principle in the parallelism given in experience which refuses to be explained in physical terms is will. "There is absolutely nothing either outside man, or within him, which he can fully and completely call his own, save his will." (20) "Pure will, however, remains a transcendental soul-concept, which empirical psychology requires as the ultimate ground of the unity of mental processes, but of which it can make no use whatever for its specific purposes.... Therefore there remains this as the final basis of consideration, namely, that soul and body are not different in themselves, but only in our conception." (21) The only admissable super-actual

<sup>(18)</sup> Die Philosophie im Zwanzigten Jahrhundert: Windelband. Article on Psychology by Wundt, p. 54.

<sup>(19)</sup> Referring to the effect of brain lesion on speech he proceeds, "we attain the result that, as already the vocables, so also the word in its most real sense is a psychophysical formation,—it is psychophysical also in the significance, that we can regard the total physiological attendant phenomena of the function of language neither as cause nor yet as result, but only as a parallel process of the psychical processes." Völkerpsych, I, Ester Thell. 511. See also, Sys. d. Phil. 600 f.

<sup>(20)</sup> Sys. d. Phil.

<sup>(21)</sup> Ibid 379.

soul is the world soul which is omnipresent in the form of volition in every particle of the universe. Mind therefore evolves from nature, "Nature is antecedent (Vorstufe) to mind, indeed in its real essence, the self-unfolding of mind." (22) Personality presupposes intelligence and self-consciousness. Real personality appertains to the world-soul. The individual, after he is developed to mature manhood participates in personality. It is the bond of social contact, dissolved when social contact is no longer necessary. (23)

As touching the problem of immortality Wundt speaks of it as an inference grounded in an egoistic hedonism, and finds warrant only for an impersonal immortality, "the conservation of psychical values, the indestructibility of all psychic creations." (24)

We now see that Wundt's heuristic principle of psychophysical parallelism has, in spite of his protests, become a metaphysical principle in which the reality of the individual is lost. The middle term which carries him to his presumed inavoidable parallelism is a negative one, namely the incompatibility of the two causal series and the consequent inconceivability of interaction. He is, moreover, emphatic in his assertion of true psychical causality.

#### II.

In attempting a criticism of Wundt's theory of the soul we shall endeavor to show several absurdities to which his theory drives him, and also the incongruity of his assertion of two independent series of causation with the denial of the respectively independent substrata.

The worthy Professor emphasizes the utter impossibility of mind in any wise operating as a cause in the realm of matter. "What can be derived from the molecular processes in the brain, are possibly other molecular processes with which they are united according to the general law of natural causality. And what we can derive from the elementary psychical processes are com-

<sup>(22)</sup> Ibid. 570.

<sup>(23)</sup> Ibid. 625. Ethics (Eng. Trans.) III, 20 f.

<sup>(24)</sup> Ibid. 670. Eisler, Leib und Seele., 196.

plex psychical formations with which they cohere according to psychological laws, which are to be estimated according to the principles of psychical causality."(25) "To suppose that this hypothetical substrate (matter) which we have constructed for certain of our ideas can exert any influence on our other ideas or on our thought in general, or that psychical activities as such could ever operate upon it, is perfectly absurd."(26)

Let us look into this absurdity. The difficulty of interaction has been fully recognized ever since Descartes, but it will not brush aside so easily. Wundt says, e. g., "We have seen (experimentally) that no idea, no mental process whatsoever can be called up again unchanged." (27) Now what is the absurdity! Psychical apperception has as its correlate in the physical organism, the formation of cerebral adaptations, due to which the connection with past experience is conserved. But if it is absurd to suppose interaction, by what twist of logic shall we overcome the absurdity when this physical conservation of past experience is to account for the fact that new experiences are modified by the past. Thus the psychical, which can have no psychical substrate, must have and must be modified by, a physical substrate, the interaction with which moreover is absurd! (28)

- (25) Ibid. 603.
- (26) Ethik, 470.
- (27) Human and Animal Psyc., 452.
- (28) Bradley, Appearance and Reality, 324.

"And with this we are brought to a well known and much-debated question. Is there a causal connection between the psychical and the physical and are we to say that one series influences the other? I will begin by stating the view which prima facie suggests itself, I will then briefly discuss some erroneous doctrines, and will end by trying to set out a defensible conclusion. And, first, the belief which occurs to the unbiased observer is that soul acts upon body and body on soul. I do not mean by this that bare soul seems to work on bare body, for such a distinction is made only by a further reflection. I mean that, if without any theory you look at the facts, you will find that changes in one series (whichever it is) are often concerned in bringing on changes in the other. Psychical and physical, each alike, make a difference to one another. It is obvious that alterations of the soul come from movements in the organism, and it is no less obvious that the latter may be consequent on the former. We may be sure that no one, except to save a theory, would deny that in volition mind influences matter. And with pain and pleasure such a denial would be even less natural. To hold that now in the individual pleasure and pain do not move, but are mere idle accompaniments, to maintain that never in past development have they ever made a difference to anything-surely this strikes the common observer as a wilful paradox. And, for myself, I doubt if most of those, who have accepted the doctrine in general, have fully realized its meaning.

"This natural view, that body and soul have influence on each other, we shall find in the end to be proof against attack."

The following from his System der Philosophie will serve to illustrate this absurdity:

"When, at the present state of our knowledge, the causal nexus appears to be interrupted on one of the two sides, we are justified to take it up on the other side and follow it further, that is, to unite psychical processes by physical intermediaries or also physical processes by psychical." (380) "Such transitions from the physiological to the psychological sphere is only permitted in emergencies of a chance interruption of the causal series, but they can never take the place of a final causal explanation." (381) "Such transitions, where experience demands them for the completion of the causal explanation are indispensable for the avoidance of gaps; such a reciprocal assistance must not only be regarded as allowed, but rather as bidden." (593)

"Nature and mind are not two coincident circles, or, as someone has well said, a circle which can be viewed from two different standpoints, the one inner, the other outer, but they are two intersecting spheres, which have only a part of their objects in common, namely sensations."

But lo, who can conceive of intersecting spheres being parallel, having the objects of sensation in common, and yet, due to the experimentally authenticated law of the closed circle of causality, utterly incompetent to causally contribute or suffer anything reciprocally! It would seem useless to expand on these statements. If the causal nexus is broken in sleep or swoon, on the psychical side, then we are bidden to connect it on the physiological side, and at the same time hold the physiological incapable of psychical causation. Das geht nicht.

Wundt, with much of present-day science, fails to do full justice to facts through his radical empiricism.

What then can be said for interaction? We all think we understand the physical series of successive processes. A physical stimulus affects the retina exciting neural activity. I learn from a given stimulus that it is caused by an object which through previous experience I have learned to call an orange. A cluster of associated ideas, desires, etc., are aroused. The idea, the associations, the desires, are psychical. Through the nervous medium the object is the occasion of the mental presentation. There is no juggling with cells able to shake up any which can account

for the initial psychical resultant without admitting a causal transmission.

On the other hand I find myself actuated by an ideal—the universal teleology of nature requires the same principle of explanation—which is the directive force in my disposal of physical energy. The mind causally disposes the body. When I am asked for my warrant for concluding to such causal connection in view of the recently discovered law of the conservation and correlation of energy according to which the energy of the universe forms a closed circle, I reply: Causality is a law of mind, universal in its application; conservation and correlation of energy is a generalization from a limited number of empirical facts within the physical universe—a generalization, furthermore, which in nowise precludes the issuance or transmission of impulse from it into another form of energy anywhere along the line—and it is illogical to deny the reality of the mind because forsooth it will not admit of reduction to the laws of physics.

The how of interaction is not yet explained, but the persistance of the reality of the distinctly psychical will not yield to the subtle "nullification act" of parallelism. Take for example a party of visitors to a menagerie. They stand before the lion's cage calmly admiring the king of beasts. By some accident the cage is unlocked and the door swings free. What happens? Calm admiration is displaced by wild terror. The retinal stimuli have undergone but little change. But the physical state has been revolutionized, and motor activity has resulted. The object caused an ideational process which in its turn caused a bodily process.

But here I have said caused when experience has only given sequence. Can I justify my judgment of causality? Hume has shown how difficult it is, if not impossible, to give positive demonstration of causation. The cause of the earth's position is the persistent velocity, together with the persistent influences regulating the direction of its passage through space. The cause of day is not the antecedent night, but another set of changes producing new conditions. Appearance seems to indicate that the connection between successive events condition the events causally. We arrive at subjective conviction of the correctness of our judgment when by our volition we bring results to pass. Our

judgment of objective causation rests upon our analogous subjective experience. The law of causation within the circle of physical energy is so construed. How much does it include? Only this, that a given quantity of physical energy is capable of an equal amount of work. It tells us "nothing of the conditions under which active energy passes into potential or vice versa." In the case above cited potential physical energy passes into active physical energy under psychical causation. The law of conservation contains nothing to preclude such interposition of the psychical cue. Thus the law of causation includes psychophysical interaction and parallelism becomes an unwarranted assumption with no excuse save an attempt to cover a gap in the line of causation which does not exist.

The final stand of the psychological dualist is on personality. The primary factors in psychical activity are personal and there is no way of explaining the consequences except in terms of personality. When Wundt would account for the evolution of personality he says it is "undoubtedly the longest step ever taken in the course of mental evolution." (29) But whence came the energy to make that longest of all steps? No, naturalistic monism cannot palm off a "long step" as an explanation of so noble and persistent a reality as personality. Personality presents us with a something more than a natural product, "this something is not natural, but supernatural, both in its powers and in its creations by means of those powers." (30)

<sup>(29)</sup> Human and Animal Psyc., 365.

<sup>(30)</sup> Thomson, Brain and Personality, 195.

#### ARTICLE II.

#### "GOD BETWEEN FOUR WALLS."

BY PROFESSOR W. H. WYNN, PH.D., D.D.

"A church," says Victor Hugo, "is God between four walls." This graphic saying expresses powerfully the ideal definition of a church—not what it always is, but what it always ought to be. The church is an assembly of men and women for spiritual ends. Religion is their interest, and that is, briefly, on its devotional side, communion with God. These people come together, not to drink in science, or philosophy, or literature, or culture—except, of course, as religion implicates all these, and joins with them in lifting the soul upward toward its God. It is religion that engages them—essentially the idea of God, crude or otherwise, that is uppermost in their minds, while they subdue themselves to a devotional frame—"God between four walls."

Well, that is anthropomorphism, says some one, a thing which our enlightened contemporaries have entirely outgrown. Go out into nature, we are advised, where that great power aforetime called God is universally diffused; make that your temple; give up your sedentary religion, your devout groping between four walls. That were counsel wisely bestowed, if it were any other than the Christian's God that had to answer to the call. When Socrates stood all night on the battlefield looking up to the stars—fixed there until day swept in upon the scene—he was worshiping the mystery of the universe, the highest theistic conception to which the Greek mind had at any time attained. Despite everything that those lofty intellects could do, they could arrive at only an impersonal divinity, and back of that was an impersonal fate.

It was altogether otherwise with the Nazarene. It was not indeed, a sedentary religion with him; he kept his church out doors, on the highways of his country, and among the fishermen's nets by the sea. He, too, for some deep reason we cannot learn, often protracted his devotions all night long under the stars. But he talked of the "Father," always, that is, of a per-

sonal God. Then, as Christians think, by the most significant gesticulation, pointing the finger heavenward and then to his own person, he indicated to all who heard him, that they should accept him as the inscrutable divinity come in the flesh.

One step more. This strange being, after having preached a faultlessly pure gospel—a gospel of rescue for every poor soul eager to have some rock of truth on which to rest—came to a tragic end, under Roman rule, on a Roman cross, lifted in this way, in redemptive spectacular agony, to the gaze of all the world. We must grant it—the most impressive feature about this wonderful story, historically considered, is the publicity of the cross. This thing was not done in a corner. Rome, the mistress of empires, and the mother of mighty civilizations yet to be, did this thing, lifted up the Nazarene, in bleeding ignominy in the august purlius of her imperial courts. There, too, they made him a grave; and there, too, under their closest espionage, he is reported to have risen from the dead.

Not to discuss this event in detail, it will suffice to say, that the extraordinary publicity of it, thrown up as it was to the keenest scrutiny of the Argus-eyed legal genius of the old Roman world, at a time when that genius was perched on the very summit of the years, and with such fullness of testimony, and force of foregone verity, as to swing the calendar of the ages henceforth round itself as a center—this, of itself, affords an historic presumption in favor of the record, which only the extremest critical audacity will venture to overlook. But all this is on the outside. The peculiar theistic experience consequent upon that event, and running in unbroken continuity from that day onward to this very hour—this, oh, this is the heart and soul of the Christ-mystery, on which we do well to rest the whole burden of our faith. The Risen One hangs on the horizon of the religious consciousness of everyone who will turn that way.

So they say. Not the ignorant, the humble, and nervous alone talk that way—the psychopaths, who kindle their fanatical fervors round the pathway of all religions—but great minds, the very greatest, indeed, of past and present times, the calmest, the most judicial and erudite—all tell us the same thing; they habitually see the Risen One, and make no scruple in approaching him as their visible God. They call this experience the brood-

ing of the Spirit of God. They come in from the world. They sit together in heavenly places. Whilst they muse, the fire burns. Many are the familiar phrases they are free to use, descriptive of that mystical experience which, at all events, lies at the heart of the religion of Jesus—the faith, if we may so call it, that the soul then and there finds personal access to a loving God. At such moments, the figure that rose above the garden of Joseph covers the entire disk of their spiritual vision—so they avow—all their Godward aspirations are satisfied in him.

We do not now institute an inquiry into the validity of this experience, asking anxiously whether, after all, it is not a pious illusion, a whim, the working of a diseased imagination, a kind of neurasthenia, of which we have so many sad examples in the pathology of the human mind. Our task does not lead us that way. We have simply to urge, that from the days of Paul and John, all down the Christian centuries, that experience has held on as the main current of devout testimony-dissent and radical schisms running off here and there, only in inconsiderable rills. If such unbroken history does not authenticate the reality of the experience, it at least, commends it to our profoundest respect. No man of fair mind, and with an amount of culture that would at all put an intelligent opinion on so grave a matter within his reach, can afford to turn on his heel, in utter contempt, of what is confessedly one of the sublimest and most persistent historical phenomena the world has ever known.

But our purpose is, to bring this thing home to the languishing churches of our day. Manifestly something that ought to flourish is fading and dying on our hands. If morals and religion are at the heart of all social life that is upward bound—a proposition which no one is disposed to deny—and if that special organization which we call the Church, is the recognized agency for conserving these—then what, alas! must follow, if the fire on that altar is suffered to die out? I do not say it has died out; plainly, in our day, only a glimmer of it is seen through the pervading gloom.

Let us see these people file into the church and take their seats. We ask for no token of reverence, the bowing of the head, the bending of the knee; all such genuflexion is absolutely of no consequence, as compared with the frame of mind, and attitude

of soul, they are there to assume. All form, all ritual, speaking after the mind and practice of the Master, does but encumber the earnest soul, and may be laid aside as obstructing, or, at all events, hampering, the free movement of the wings of faith Godward, in its silent flight. Manifestly the devout worshiper is not there for that.

Perhaps it would not be wide of the mark to say—could we know what is really in the purpose of the great majority of those who frequent our churches—that they are there primarily to hear the discourse. With most of us worship begins and ends with the attentive or listless hearing of what the preacher has to say; and, under this condition of things, the preacher is a most remarkable man, who can withhold himself from falling speedily into a chill intellectualism, or a dull routine. For don't you see, there is only one thing to do, and the all-comprehensive preacher has that business devolving on him—the disaster almost certain to follow, a powerful sermon, possibly, will be blown at random on the empty air. And then the egoism of it! It is not God between four walls, but the preacher vigorously spreading himself to monopolize the whole space.

Somewhere we have seen the speculation that preaching is an act of worship, as much as prayer and praise, as much so as that upward movement of the soul that brings it into cloistered nearness with its God. Well, for the most part, it would have to be worship by an exceeding far off and devious route. The sermon, by supposition, instructs and inspires, but the whole substance and final issue of it should be, the delight and duty of finding God between the four walls, and keeping close to Him out on the streets. As things are now it is difficult for the act of preaching to keep itself always in a worshipful mood. Worship goes out from itself; the egotism of preaching, as now flattered and exalted, would turn into its own little eddy the whole sea of human interest, now, and for the eternal years to come. It is preach, preach, in a round of wearisome iteration, until the ear becomes exasperated, and the patient parishioner rises up in revolt.

And so the Church comes to be a kind of talking institution, from the absorbing function of the pulpit, in an order of things we have not the sagacity to see is quite outgrown. Can you

talk? The value of your services in pushing on the kingdom, is set to a scale of reckoning that falls at last on the fluency of your speech. The practice runs wildly among the laity, who are expected to attest their zeal in their capacity to talk. They must bruit their experiences, or pour out their exhortations in pious rhapsody, if they are to have any rank or recognition among those who ticket them authoritatively into the kingdom—those who determine in this way their standing with God.

But, as might be expected, the pulpit itself is the chief victim—falls most easily a prey to the ruinous egotism that is almost inseparable from the absorbing place assigned it, the repository of the whole devout curriculum of the Sabbath day. It readily becomes a school of oratory, where the rhetorical acrobat can do his most skillful tumbling, or the logical expert throw himself into the air, in perilous pursuit of some startling paradox, but

always at last light on his feet.

The abuses of our elocutionary evangelism here find an open door. Given some charms of person, a ruddy touch of youth on the cheek, a resonant and sympathetic voice, and an audacity of nerve that is never in anywise abashed, having no reference now whatever to any depth of religious insight, or richness of intellectual outfit—you have here just the preacher who can win his way most easily to the most munificently endowed pulpit of the land. The multitude will rush to hear him preach. Business men will furnish their money freely, becauses they wish to be entertained. He can entertain. Wit, originality, eloquence, the tricks of the actor, eccentricities that lead the eye and ear captive—these all have an ample theatre here; great multitudes hasten to hang on that voice.

And why not? There is no triumph greater for him who speaks, and no luxury more exquisite for him who hears. It is a rare gift—this thing of swaying the minds of the multitude this way and that by the living voice. Eloquence, declamatory and impassioned utterance, when the occasion calls, and the soul of the speaker is enriched with experience, and an intelligent zeal for the cause he represents—this is one of the most powerful agencies for good known among men. But in the pulpit, as things now are, the effort to produce that sort of thing becomes unavoidably factitious and imitative, and then—oh, what a

blight, and how utterly incompatible with the spirit and method of the Nazarene!

Somewhere we have seen the suggestion, that reform in the churches must begin with the pulpit, and that somehow the whole scope and character of that function should be carefully revised. Why not invoke the kingdom of silence, once more, to heal the vociferating habit of our noisy years, and get rid of the elocutionary clatter and boistrous evangelism that storms in upon the inalienable calm of prayer and worship, replacing with drum and thunder the effective whisperings of the still small voice? In any event the problem is one that must not be rudely approached.

Among the earliest and tenderest recollections of childhood is that of the preacher in his pulpit, bending over an open Bible. and the people in quiet and reverent attitude looking up to him from below. It is all a vision of still life. There is no voice, no movement—the hand of the preacher is still pendent in the air where the gesture was made, and the singers in the organ loft are mute and statuesque, as evermore in the attitude to sing. The air of devotion lies all along the silent aisles. Childish eyes are still fixed upon the uncurtained windows, beyond which the dear old hills are still wrapt round with a Sabbath calm, and the gilded lettering of the nearer tombstones is still shimmering in the sun. Within everything is suggestive, the drapery behind the pulpit, the Bible on it, the lampstands at the side, the railing round the altar, the unadorned walls, except for the shifting shadows of the trees, waving lazily just outside the window under the breath of the summer wind-everything holds the childish spirit entranced before its God.

Now what has happened to this child? He has had religious training at home, or he would not have been there in the church. His mother has taught him; his father has here and there dropped a word. Some portion of the story of Jesus has crept into his mind; the manger; the march from Olivet; the crown of thorns; all that dark and dreadful scene of men turned into demons with their innocent victim hanging on the cross. And then, if it be Easter morning, his little imagination has caught, in feeble outline it may be, but with a realization deeper than we are apt to think, the vastness and glory of the Risen One, to whom these grown people are putting up their prayers. What

they mean by it he will probably never venture to imagine—neither now, in the years of his inquisitive ardor, nor in the longer years of his struggle with scepticism under the shadow of his sins. There on the threshold of his religious life, he saw the preacher but understood him not. All things around him were solemn symbol, and whosoever would address him must have the tongue of an angel, and use a dialect never heard among men.

To speak more plainly, the first thing learned in religion is how to pray; and it is the last. Worship! Worship! That is the word; and in the religion of Jesus, it is clearly and definitely the worship of Him. Stand at the doors of your churches, and ask the people who are flocking thither, what it is that they seriously contemplate in the act. If it is custom-dead and inert custom -assuaged and softened by the hollow glitter of fashion, and mincing the phrase of social hypocrisy as they rustle in-thenlet them shoulder their budget and be gone. Or, more than likely, a noted pulpit orator, or dramatizing evangelist, is there, who has charms of utterance, and swift sallies of wit and invective, wherewith to feed the insatiable craving for novelty in the audiences he will draw, and who will hold them there until his last sky-rocket has been shot in the air-if this be the motive, better the church doors were closed, and Ichabod written all over the crumbling walls.

You can recall the time-in illustration of this line of remark-when some noted preacher happened your way, and you joined the eager, curious, and unmannerly multitude, in pushing your steps to some bare standing spot within reach of his voice. The air was stifling, the jam crushing, and the temper of the crowd anything but devout. All preliminaries were hurried through with business like speed, and the great preacher was given free sweep over this harvest of souls. He succeeded, of course. All conditions were favorable, and the stars in their courses were waiting on him. Wit and pathos were alternately at his beck, stories, arguments, the long wail of the man in despair, and the loud shout of the prisoner, when his fetters were stricken off, and his prison doors were flung wide. Fight against it as you would, the orator's magic took you into its meshes, and you felt a genuine ecstasy in being flattered and abused, wheedled and worshiped, as the whim of the speaker might have it in mind. In the end, you had to reckon up, that many profound and salutary truths had been uttered, and extraordinary skill displayed in swaying the emotions of men, this way and that, as a field of grain will bend under contrary winds. In short, the orator has had a triumph, and you are ready with your parsley wreath to crown him on the spot.

But what else? Without presumption we will venture to say, that you had not long been released from the spell of that man's magic, until you began to question whether there was anything religious in it at all—whether the preacher's performance was anything more than a successful exhibition of histrionic art. Certainly the lowly Nazarene was not there. There was no room for him there; the spirit of the place shut him out. Not a breath of worship is possible in an atmosphere of that kind. Here is a condition of things in which the preacher's personality over-shadows everything else; he is the little god of the moment, and it is clearly observable in all his movements, that he is well enough satisfied that so it should be.

The general principle we will be obliged to accept, that in all spiritual service pious egotism is an immitigable blight. man with the orator's gifts and accomplishments, and wanting them to be put down freely at the Master's feet, will allow himself to be drawn into the whirl of a curious and adulating crowd, or to be implicated in any method of evangelism, that will exploit his powers as a prevailing instrumentality in opening the doors of the kingdom to the wayward children of men. It is one of the current abuses of the pulpit, that it seeks the eager and curious crowd. Competitive Christianity, no doubt, is largely responsible for this state of things. We must maintain our organization, and it is absolutely necessary that numbers should prop up our temple walls. There is no progress with empty pews. And if the preacher has not the voice, and personality, and zealor, in default of these, the buffoonery-to draw the crowd, and fasten them in plighted devotion to our cause, why, plainly our cause is gone, the doors of our temple will have to be closed up. If that be the predicament, we might very well ask, whether it were not imperative now, at this moment, to close up those doors?

But the evil, as we see it, is deeper than that. It is the undue exaltation of the preacher's office in an order of things, which will not admit the intrusion of any agency or influence that would divert the soul of the worshiper from immediate access to its God. It is worship, spiritual worship, the worship of Jesus in spirit and in truth, that should draw men together in their religious assemblies, or, otherwise it is best they should not be there at all. If they come to be wrought upon by the preacher, to see him wave the banner, to march in time to the call of his silver bugle, and, then, when the silver bugle has grown hoarse, or has been drawn off with its challenging thunder to some other post—then, to drop aloof, or turn in some other direction, where some new bugle is sounding—oh, what a mockery is this, and what a sore travesty it is on that religion that came not crying in the streets!

We have here that condition of things about which the Apostle scolded, in the church at Corinth—the worship of the preacher, Paul, Apollos, Cephas, behind whom the image of the Risen One has faded entirely out of view. It is the awful mistake of thinking that the Church flourishes, not as worship flourishes, but as the preacher is powerful to make his personality known, and as the curious multitudes throng the aisles to hang upon the music of his voice. Here we are—great crowds of us—our four walls filled to bursting—the doors jammed—the ushers fluttering up and down the passage-ways, in despairing search for seats for the rich and fashionable, who have absented themselves from felicity awhile, to witness our highly Christian show! Meantime not a wave of worship, not a ripple, has ruffled anywhere the carnal calm of this sea of souls.

But we are assuming that worship, the worship of Jesus, is the one supreme end of the religious assembly called together in His name. Let us, for a moment, inquire what worship is: We are so prone to conceive of it as ritual, as a formal service devoutly intoned; or, at least, as a loud prayer put up by some one, amid a company of bowed heads and closed eyes, to which the silent ones are yielding their accord, that—a warning, at all events, against this popular misconception may be ventured, as the special spiritual counsel to the times in which we live.

The Master knew best when He talked with the woman at the well. It was not in Gerizim, nor yet at Jerusalem,—no locality, and by implication, no form or function can pre-empt the uni-

versal right and duty of worship—the right the soul has, without intermediation, to lift itself upward to its God. It is the individual spirit passing into spirit, even as a stream will empty itself into the fathomless sea. "God is Spirit." (not a Spirit) and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit," an exercise possible to take place only in the closet of the soul. The art of all devout arts is the art of prayer, and that has been most clearly defined by one who certainly knew best how it should be done. "When thou prayest, enter into thy closet"—metaphor, of course, meaning the privacy of the soul—"and when thou hast shut the door," that is, made thy mental privacy complete—then "throw thyself immediately upon the bosom of thy God."

Do we catch the meaning of all this? Is it going too far to say, that Jesus never recommended public prayer, and never, so far as we know, practiced it, unless it was at the grave of Lazarus, where it was rather the out-gushing of a groan, or lamentation, than a formal prayer? Plainly, all his teaching on the subject of worship points directly to the conclusion, that it is genuine only, or most so, when exercised under the chartered privacy of the human soul. In his day, as in our own, there were certain garrulous persons, who wanted to be known for the fluency and unction of their prayers, whining out their longwinded devotions, standing in the synagogues, and on the corners of the streets. They were hypocrites, of course, turning the essential privacy of devotion into an egotistical and disgusting show.

Well, then, here is a difficulty. If worship, to be genuine, is so thoroughly individualistic, and refuses to have its privacy invaded, why call it into the public assembly at all—why say, that the public assembly must have this thing specifically at heart? Publicity in the care of privacy? Would not that be a paradox quite too startling to be entertained?

It is a sufficient answer to this, to note the familiar experience of the collective energy of many souls in co-ordinating effort, in the same place, to the same end. There is a great power in numbers, if their aim is one—a kind of multitudinous privacy that is mystically lifted on currents of feeling, circulating without voice, in consecrated silence from soul to soul. This is worship. Alas! we sometimes fear that its opportunity is gone, in a con-

dition of things where the preacher's voice is continually ringing in the ears of the worshiper, many times a heartless clatter at his closet door; and where loud and vehement song is made to do service, by turning the congenial silences of devotion into a tremendous roar.

A little farther let us characterize this state of things. Enter any one of our churches, liturgical or plain, on a Sabbath morning, and dwell thoughtfully on what is going on around you. You cannot avoid the impression that the minister is struggling with an impossible task; is carrying a burden too heavy for any human shoulders to bear. He is not simply preacher, but also priest. And then there is talk all around you of pastoral service, a kind of everyday shepherding he is expected to do, to keep his flock together, and add to their number, as against any imputation of dereliction in the efficiency of his work. Is it any wonder that he gets up timidly in his pulpit—tired, worn, apprehensive, and with a painful sense that he is belaboring a mountain, which, despite his most heroic faith, will not tear itself up, and be cast into the sea?

Prophet, priest, captain—these diversified functions are by no means all that attach to the skirts of this saintly little man. He is business manager, diplomat, master of ceremonies, the advance guard in all aggressive movements that his church must make upon the world, if it is to keep up its standing with others in the field. Practically, he is a little Atlas with this whole little world on his back. But the world he carries is not a little world—it is rather, the bulk of two worlds he is trying to shoulder; not on his own account, which were something to be rationally entertained, but for the souls of others, a thing beyond the power of any mortal man to undertake.

Let us, once for all, understand that worship by proxy is a bad absurdity in the nature of the case, a religious mockery in the sight of God. It is according to the genius of the Christian religion, inhering in it, fundamentally and indefeasibly, that every man should be his own priest. There is but one altar for pulpit and pew, and that is the altar of one's own heart; but one sacrifice, the wholesale surrender of oneself to his God. To set up an altar outside the human soul is an anachronism, and, after the year of our Lord, and in the superior enlightenment of our own

time, a usurpation of the one sole universal priesthood of the Son of Man. We should think of this same Son of Man under escort through all the courts and cloisters of the Jewish temple, looking upon its massive foundations and pillared porticos, its altars, its lavatories, its vessels of silver and gold—the consummate flower of an era of ritual—and, then, turning on it all, with the stern prophecy that, in a little while, it should be leveled to the ground, and that the spiritual residue of it should survive, plenarily, in his own glorified humanity outstripping the tomb—those memorable words of his, decisive, fateful, final: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up again," meaning, obviously, that his risen personality should substitute and replace the faded splendors of the temple, and be the sole condensed ritual of the newer time.

Yes, that is it—the lesson sweeps in upon us like the song of angels from another sphere. In that newer time-God grant it may not long delay-spiritual worship will consist in catching that glorified image on the horizon of the human soul. The religious imagination shall then have place. The heavens will break out in resurrection splendors for every one who will but reverently close his eyes. There will be no need of priestly mediation any more, although, doubtless, the illusion will long cling to the slowly opening experience of men, and even be provisionally fostered, as in the past it was, in times of great social confusion, when the soil of our modern life was getting ready for the planting of the Church. Mediaevalism was beneficent priestcraft, a kindly condescension to the crude heathen mind, coming over from consummate moral darkness to the incommensurable blaze of the religion of Jesus, which must have blinded by excess of light, had it not been tempered to their vision by the considerate accommodation of the priests. But when they would fix in theory that which was provisional and beneficent in practice, and impose an authoritative hierarchy on men, a scale of vicegerent functions, so to speak, with power to open doors and shut them, on poor souls wanting to find access to their Lord-then the Religious Reformation of the sixteenth century was due, and the stupendous ecclesiastical assumption had to go down.

Now it is not too much to say, that our modern pulpit, and the routine of worship it subserves, are but tardily reclaimed from the subtle ecclesiasticism, that for so long a time had all Christendom in its embrace, and that nestles now so congenially in the bosoms of ambitious men. The preacher unconsciously climbs up into the place of God. He is mediator all unawares, even in the act of protesting loudly that he is not. He is the people's proxy before the throne of grace. Living in a day when there are no priests, he nevertheless carries a priestly air with him wherever he goes, as if to say: "I open to you the highway to God, in the system of truth I promulgate in your hearing, and in the intercessions I make for you, officially, when I lift you up on the arms of my prayer to the bosom of his love." Of course, he does no such thing. The highway to God is opened out for every man by the transcendent figure that is vividly outlined on the empyrean of his prayer; and no man can open out that vision for another man, though he preach with the eloquence of Gabriel, and outdo Daniel in the unction of his prayers.

Well, then, is there no place in the public assembly for preaching, and for intercessory prayer? It will be carefully noted, that we have no derogatory word for these two powerful agencies in pushing forward the cause of the kingdom in the world. The Master used them. He preached, speaking meanwhile as never man spake. He prayed for Peter—infirm Peter, who greatly needed the co-ordinating support of other men's prayers—prayed for him that Satan might not have him to sift him like wheat. What we urge is, that, after the resurrection, no man can worship

Jesus vicariously for another man.

What we think we observe in the routine of public worship everywhere, is the priestly assumption, either systematically or surreptitiously set forth, that the worship of Jesus by proxy is not only a thing possible in the ministering functions of the Church, but a duty sacredly enjoined. Such a thing, we need not hesitate to pronounce a delusion and a snare. It must contract greatly the area of spiritual worship in the religious assemblies that come together ostensibly for that purpose on the Sabbath day. Indeed, as we look over our congregation on a Sabbath morning, we grope painfully for any evidence of that exercise in anything that goes on visibly before our eyes. It need not be in the preaching; it need not be in the sacred song; it need not be in the elaborate ritual devoutly intoned. These are

intermediary offices, and have no spiritual worth whatever, except as the worship of Jesus has gone before—the mystic well, so to speak, into which the bruised soul of the worshiper has been dipped and healed. Without this, they have no element of worship in them at all, no more than in those old Jewish mockeries, against which the prophets so loudly proclaimed.

Now what do we find? Outside of these formal offices of preaching, prayer, and praise-all of collective efficacy-there is no special schedule, so far as appears, for that closet exercise, whereby each individual soul addresses itself personally to its God, out of the multitudinous silences of many souls engaged in the same act. There is no opportunity for the practice of the presence of the glorified Jesus, among many devout spirits blending, in this way, into that one attitude of soul that alone deserves the name of worship-no time for it, no place for it, in the order that prevails. Indeed, we are left in doubt as to whether the worship of Jesus is in contemplation at all, among these people who are loudest in urging it, and who make it the distinctive mark of the doctrinal system they adopt. Their prayers are not habitually addressed to Him. They are fond of those accommodating phrases and titles descriptive of Him in the Scriptures, as "Son of God," "Mediator," "Propitiator," and so on, timetitles, to be held in the mind only while the human side of the incarnate mystery is under review, but meaningless when the eye of faith is fixed upon that glorified figure-conceived now as plenarily endowed with the attributes of deity, if of deific rank at all.

Plainly, if Jesus be God to these people, he is an absentee God. What other idea can they have of him, if they accept literally the traditional formula concerning him, that he "ascended on high, and sitteth at the right hand of God"—both he and the Father exiled, in this way, from the hearts in which he promised to dwell? Luther's apothegm that "the right hand of God is everywhere," has never taken that profound hold of the mind of Christendom, that its wonderful insight and wisdom would entitle it to, because peradventure, in the mind of its author, it was too closely interwoven with an objective order of things, round which the schools of theology, in those days, were wildly at war. None the less, the divinity of Jesus cannot be adequately conceived except

as the omnipresent God. And yet one listens in vain for any wholesale recognition of him as God—the one sole God, as he must be—in the oral prayers that go up in great profusion, and with much apparent ardor, from the pulpit and the pew—go up quite uniformally to the Father in his name.

O, yes, this was his own instruction, that we put up our petitions to God in his name. But were it not well to inquire seriously what might be the meaning of so singular a condition laid in this way at the heart of prevailing prayer. Negatively it cannot mean the mere use of his name, as a verbal endorsement to a petition that, under this guarantee, gets audience in the ear of God—a surety, an underwriter, a sponsor, that the case going up to God is worthy to be heard. The real God, in that case, is yonder on his heavenly throne, and the marvelous messenger that has come to us in His behalf, is simply clothed with powers plenipotentiary to execute His will among men, but is in no sense the Principal whom he represents.

Of course, these gross conceptions of Jesus may be entertained, in so far as they help the crude and immature thinking of sincere inquirers pressing for light; but, after thousands of years' experience and learned research, it is safe to assume, that we have acquired sufficient nerve and sinew to lay vigorous hold on the religion we profess. At all events the alternative is on us to make the glorified Jesus the Christian's God—without mental reservation, with no clouds or darkness lying round his pathway—this, or we must give the whole story over to be the sport of the winds. Being thus valiant, we will throng our temples for the express purpose of worshiping him, but, most assuredly, to find great piles of traditional debris which we must sweep from our doors.

Here is our note of triumph. If Jesus is the Christian's God, he is not a quasi-God; not one simply having the value of God; not a subordinate God; not an instrumental God; not one who works for ends in history and providence that are not wholly his own. Oh, how much spiritual force is squandered in calling men to him, not as God—sole God—able to satisfy all Godward aspirations that any human soul can entertain—but as an expedient, a subsidy, a provisional daysman, a demiurge, that will

balance our defaulting record for us, and bridge our way to the supreme God whom he simply represents.

Let us settle it, once for all, in our minds, that God is never a means to an end—the very idea is unthinkable; and if Jesus is to be worshiped as God, and not simply by way of theological apotheosis, then all other doors of theistic illumination must be shut up, and the vision of the soul must be opened out only on him. We recall how, on the Mount of Transfiguration, the celestial triumvirate flashed for a moment on the high air of revelation, and then, when the luminous cloud had rolled away, and the benumbed senses of the prostrate disciples had fairly recovered from the shock, they "saw no one, save Jesus only." With these words let us hush the voice of controversy in precincts so sacred, and in the presence of a mystery so beatific and profound.

Tacoma, Wash.

#### ARTICLE III.

#### FREEDOM OF TEACHING.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D.

Truth is a factor of such immeasurable consequence that it may not be trifled with. The question of Pontius Pilate, "What is truth?" is fundamental, and is not to be dealt with or answered evasively. Whether or not the Roman procurator spoke as a sober inquirer when he seemed to be impressed by a mysterious majesty in the attitude of the friendless and yet fearless prisoner who stood before him, he nevertheless uttered an inquiry that pertains to that which is basic. If he spoke in careless flippancy, or in weak despair, in the one case, he spoke that which is unworthy of a man, or in the other with a pathos as old as the human race. But long before Pontius Pilate, the Sophists of Greece had raised practically the same issue as to the questionableness of all knowledge, holding practically that one man's opinion is as good as another's, and that all opinions are equally unreliable. This was the principle of subjectivity run mad, each Sophist creating, practically his own intellectual universe, caring but little, if anything, whether or not it coincided with any other sphere or system of thought, and remaining entirely unconvinced that under any system there lay any kind of basal reality. There were Sophists who even prided themselves upon their ability to take either side of any question, and to demonstrate the position or negative view with equal suc-They constituted a class of intellectual acrobats capable of performing a variety of mental feats much according to the tastes and inclinations of the patrons of their peculiar kind of dexterity. Scouting the idea of attaining to any assured conviction regarding truth they were willing to use their intellectual acuteness in performing a kind of mental gymnastics upon a tight rope in mid-air and with no particular end to be gained excepting the possible delight afforded by a bootless intellectual undertaking. Now there is a modern species of sophism just as there was an ancient philosophic species of quibbling. If Pilate was indulging in flippancy when the Divine Man of sorrows stood arraigned before him, he is not without successors. Lessing, too, who proclaimed the theory that as a mental stimulant the pursuit of truth is after all of greater value than the actual possession of the truth, it would seem has modern successors. Philosophically his theory may be in accordance with sound wisdom, but when we come to deal with the fundamental and eternal issues of religion, for example, we want not speculations, and not even the pleasures of the pursuit, but solid ground.

Now the temper of the period in which we are living is liable to foster this attitude of mind even toward so great a subject as the Christian religion. Ours is, for example, in one of its aspects an age of revisions. Nearly everything that men have thought out and arranged and set in some sort of mental order, is being taken down, overhauled, readjusted and presented in a new, if not altogether different form. Especially is this true of the achievements of science and philosophy. It used to be said that the first part of Milton's Paradise Lost was written upon the assumption that this planet on which we now dwell was the center and that everything revolved around it. It was further alleged that the last part of the same book was written upon the theory that the sun was the center and that everything accordingly revolved about that planet. It serves to show with what rapidity one scientific theory may be made to follow another widely divergent in character. It may be recalled that it is but a few years ago that the scientific world was thrown into a kind of ecstacy of what passed current as scientific joy over the tenets enunciations and prophecies that were being proclaimed and classified under the name Darwinism. It is but stating the plain truth now to say that if the recent deliverances and judgments of noted scholars on the failure of the commonly received evolutionary theory longer to command their acceptance are to be taken seriously, we shall soon be summoned with bowed heads and weeping eyes to sit at the death-bed of this once widely accepted explanation of the universe and of man. This revolution and rejection in the scientific world indicate a drift. They manifest the spirit of a period in which truth is liable to get put down and error put up; a time in which, unless truth be estimated at its real worth and confessed in its integrity, some sophisticated Barabbas is likely to be thrust upon us instead of the Lord of Glory. Now, unless the old through-going scepticism of the Grecian days shall be made to pass current as true wisdom, there must somewhere be some established truth, and if so it is the business of men to find it out, set it forth in its rightful supremacy and confess it in its integrity. Absolute scepticism means the stullification of the reason and in the commercial and business worlds at least, know-nothingism is at a discount continually. If in the common affairs of the sordid and greed world there are no sceptics or agnostics, can any adequate reason be assigned why a man should demit his intellectual rights as soon as it is proposed to think upon unworldly themes and religious subjects, to state truth in explicit forms of statement and to which honest men are expected to adhere in an unambiguous way when once they have given their voluntary assent. If men bank on truth for the purposes of worldly gain and traffic and if they hold fast to certain statements of belief regarding the social and political organization of society, why should it be otherwise when they come to express the purposes and value of the invisible and spiritual life? In a critical period, in an age of social upheavals, intellectual revolutions and credal cataclysms the Church, as the witness to the truth, must remember that it is by no means immune against tendencies which corrupt and the forces that induce impotency if they do not breed decay. In such a time it may become hypercritical, too severely intellectual and sympathetic and then its strength may become its weakness and the source of its decline. If it become indifferent to the truth confessed it shall certainly be stricken with the malaria of sceptimost a synonym of death. It is not to outlaw the legitimate latmost a synonym of death. It is not to outlaw the legitimate attitudes of liberty. These should be at once generous but clearly fixed, for if in enthroning freedom it tramples under foot the legitimate and historically approved safeguards of sound and wholesome teaching, it throws harmony to the winds and introduces factors that work for powerlessness and disruption. Philosophy may be precious, liberty certainly is precious but the conservation and confession of the truth is the most important of all. The demands for intellectual liberty may be pushed too far and the difference between liberty of thought and liberty of

teaching may be confused. A teacher of the Church, in pulpit or in school, is a man and a man must follow his convictions. But to say this does not mean that any man has a right to teach anything in any church or in any institution. If a man is in duty bound to follow his convictions, he is just as much in duty bound to be constantly seeking after still more important convictions, and must meanwhile have some regard for the corporate convictions expressed by the body of believers. There are men who claim the right to teach anything and anywhere and under any conditions. The fallacy of such an assumption is apparent. A man has a right to think or to say what he pleases. but not a right to draw a specific salary for so doing and which has been provided by people whose expressed beliefs he seeks to undermine. If a man proposes to insert speculation and guesses where the attested doctrines of the divine word ought to maintain, if he professes the new and limping to the old and tried, if he chooses the superficial and frothy fad of a day in preference to that which lavs hold upon the soul of a man, certainly that is his privilege. But if his choices amount to convictions, and they are dear to him as a real man's convictions should be, he must be prepared in all good conscience to pay the bills incurred by that which may be purely individualistic and doctrinaire. It is hardly up to the standard of sound ethics for theorizing teachers to live off of other people while combating the views which those same people have set forth in unambiguous terms.

Additional emphasis is added to what has just been said if we recall how little is left of the truths once confessed by some evangelical churches, if the eliminations of some of their accredited teachers are to be accepted as correct and warranted. Here, for example, is one such accredited church teacher who proposes to tell "what is permanent in Christanity." The question he proposes to answer is thus stated in his own words; "What is permanent and what is transient in the Christianity of the New Testament? Eighteen hundred years have passed since the last of the books was written, and now what has endured? What has proved temporary and useless to the Christian of to-day?" Such a question arouses interest, for we are certainly interested to know what is permanent in Christianity. The question is, is there anything in the New Testament; any

one great doctrine or any co-ordinated system of doctrine, that may be looked upon as permanent and regarded and confessed as imperishable? Accordingly we read with deep interest this announcement that, "the heart of humanity still, as in all ages. is crying out toward God." This, according to this duly accredited teacher, is one of the two "permanent" things left in the catalogue of Christianity. But a little induction into the facts of human history and experience as well as the teaching of the Scriptures will soon show that what is here alleged as permanent is contrary to the truth. It is not even correct to assert that the heart of humanity is "crying out to God." If Paul was right and he has been amply corroborated by the facts adduced in missionary history, when he affirmed the justice of the condemnation of the heathen because that "when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed beasts and creeping things. Wherefore God gave them up to uncleanness..... For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections.... And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things that are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness..... Who knowing the judgment of God that they who commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in those who do them." (Rom. i. 21-23).

The great apostle knew heathenism as only a missionary among heathen people can know it and his observation and experience, committed to us in an inspired record, does not corroborate this groundless and unspiritual allegation about the first of the "permanent" features. But the second permanent thing in Christianity referred to is declared to be this: "The living preacher with voice and personality." In this statement there is more truth than in the one above quoted, but this is only partial and is totally inadequate. Undoubtedly the preacher will always have his place and mission. God hath set that vocation in the supremacy and it dare not abdicate. It hath pleased God to save them that believe "by the foolishness."

of preaching" and yet it hath also pleased God to use other agencies also in the dissemination of the truth of the Gospel. True it is that no other agency can supplant that of the living preacher of righteousness and salvation, and yet the printing press, for example, has proven to be something of an agency honored of God. The written word of God has been doing its work and we are constantly hearing of the power and efficiency of that word in turning the thoughts of men to the things which pertain to their salvation, so that in deed and in truth they are led to "cry out toward God." Some parts of the Church, at least, have learned through painful and yet profitable experience, that it is only when the Holy Spirit energizes the word, forcing it upon the attention of men and giving vitality to its supremely important truths, that even it possesess transforming power. Men have read and have heard and continued in sin, as though they had neither heard nor read. What has thus been quoted are the utterances of an accredited and prominent teacher of an evangelical' church. It will thus be seen that his process of elimination has advanced to the point where there are but two things that are permanent in Christianity, but two factors are left, and these are the crying out of humanity after God, and the need of the living preacher to show to the inquiring and crying humanity the way of life which, according to the same teacher, may or may not be to-day what it was in the days when Paul and Peter and John, the great apostolic triumvirate, were its accredited Freedom expressing itself as subtraction could teachers. hardly go further. We have had theological and critical modification, evisceration and substitution with the resultant weakening, marring and disfiguring of the historic character and testimony of the Church. It could hardly be maintaned that this process of omission or exclusion can fail to cripple her at a time when the strongest and most definite witness bearing is needed. to withstand an alleged "New Theology," consisting mainly of revamped but whipped out heresies and which is demanding recognition at the bar of Christian opinion.

Another mark of the kind of freedom of which we have been speaking, is its hostility to what it is pleased to call "dogma."

A dogma is a doctrinal proposition drawn from the Scriptures and accurately expressed in language. Now, a church, like any

other organization, must stand for something, if it has any mission. It must possess a recognized standing and place. It must represent a distinctive idea, dogma or life. Development comes out of its central and dominating principle whatever that may be. Only thus can any species of ecclesiasticism exert any staying or commanding power. In proportion as it is strong in its shaping type of truth, order and practice does its influence deepen and widen. Education, inherited and historic influences and associations have emerged in the progress of the kingdom of God. Varying apprehensions of the Gospel, and differing interpretations of the redemptive scheme in all its bearings and relations have produced some things worthy of distinctive preservation and perpetuation. All these are conserved and set forth in the dogmatic statements of the Church. They are a mental and religious necessity. Notwithstanding, much hatred of dogma has been fostered in the name of freedom. There are thoughtless people and supposedly learned people who denounce it in unmeasured terms. Others swerve and others in increasing numbers turn to what they call the "broad" views claiming to hold to truth but decrying all formulations of it. They desire liberty of thinking and expression and do much masquerading in the robes of freedom. Such seem to disregard the fact that truth has its metes and bounds, and that God has put it in specific compass and relation. He has clearly and positively revealed it in due form and proper effect. The Scriptures define emphasize and illustrate it. The Church is commanded to keep within its bounds, to uphold it, defend it, illustrate it and enforce it. We must come to know and study it in legitimate proportion, connection and application. In relation to it there must be depth and definiteness as well as breadth. A living theologian of liberal tendencies, Dr. William Adams Brown, says in his "Christian Theology in Outline," "Men work together effectively in proportion as they understand one another, and are conscious of seeking the same ends. This understanding theology seeks to promote. The higher the grade of civilization the greater the importance of this intellectual understanding In the lower forms of religion dogma has a subordinate place." Speaking of the importance to the preacher of definite and just views of Christian doctrine, Dr. Augustus H. Strong, a pronounced evangelical, says in the first volume of his recently published Systematic Theology, "His chief intellectual qualification must be the power clearly and comprehensively to conceive and accurately and powerfully to express the truth." How this high function of the preacher is to be maintained without dogma it would be difficult to perceive. The estimate placed upon dogma by even a rationalistic writer of unusual penetration and force, Sir Leslie Stephen, is expressed in these words:

"Christianity, as it is understood by ultramontanes or by ultra-Protestants, implies a body of beliefs of unspeakable importance to the world. They may be true or they may be false, but they cannot be set aside as perfectly indifferent. Man is or is not placed here for a brief interval which is to decide his happiness or his misery throughout all eternity. His situation does or does not depend upon his allegiance to the Church, or upon his undergoing a certain spiritual change. Christ came or did not come from God, and died or did not die to reconcile man to his Maker. An infidel is a man who accepts the negative of those propositions; a Christian is one who takes the affirmative; an unsectarian Christian, if he has any belief at all, is one who says that they may or may not be true, and it does not much matter. If that is a roundabout way of expressing agreement with the infidel, the statement is intelligible, though its sincerity is questionable. But, taking it literally, it is surely the most incredible of all the assertions that a human being can possibly put forward."

It must have been a matter of surprise to some who have been watching the irrational and unscriptural drift of things theologically away from dogma to have noticed that the lecturers at one of the more recent Harvard Summer Schools of Theology, should have been found with such hearty unanimity, insisting upon dogma as essential to religion. The professors who were in attendance were of such different casts of mind and of such diverse schools of theology that at the time, the agreement on this point was much commented upon. Professor Palmer of Harvard protested against a religion that consisted merely in emotion, worship and good works, without the element of dogma. Professor Nash of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, declared that altruism without dogma was hopeless.

Professor King of Oberlin, in the course of his lectures on The Obscurity of Religious Truths said: "The fundamental implication of all thinking and knowledge requires some kind of final theistic assumption," [i. e., a dogma] and added, "the truth is always greater than our reasons for holding it." The conclusion reached and set forth by Professor Peabody, and said to be assented to by other lecturers, was in these words: "Reliance upon God as the great Reality and recourse to the fact of Christ, or in other words, a dogma that is personal not mechanical." These citations with but a single exception have not been from Lutheran and other pronounced evangelical sources, but are the utterances of scholars of the more liberal school, who have the scholarship and piety to form a sufficient, fair and adequate estimate of the importance of the place of substance in religion to keep them from joining in the modern hue and cry against dogma, in the good name of freedom. They are not inclined, it will appear, to contrast religion with its theological statement. and lay so much stress on the former as to reduce the latter to a mere matter of option. As wise, thoughtful and trained men they can see that such a procedure would ultimately be as misleading as it would be to cast scorn upon the bones of the hand when compared with their fleshy covering. A religion that has no dogmatic statements to present and maintain about Trinity and Incarnation, fall and sin, devil and angel, miracles and supernatural, law and grace, Christ, redemption and its application, resurrection and final judgment, which has no definite need of God, and no clear thought concerning man, is a religion that is certain to end in a sort of emotional nebulosity and is useless for all the highest purposes of Christianity. It is an almost certain proof of both narrowness and shallowness when a man falls into a state of mental hostility toward dogmatic statements in theology. The solid thinker and the real student know that where there is a mind there must be belief, and a dogma is but the expressed belief of a reasoning mind. A rational being can no more continue rational without believing something than the physical body can continue living without breathing. The very assertion in the name of freedom of a revolt against a dogmatic Christianity is at least one dogma in the creed of the sceptic.

But the freedom of teaching, now under consideration, is most

of all insisted upon when the subject for consideration is the place of the creeds of the churches and the estimate to be placed upon them by one who has voluntarily assented to order his teaching in harmony therewith. "The curse of creeds," said a journal of wide influence recently, "lies in the insistence that they shall be asserted as the representative belief of the churches after they have ceased to be believed." In reply to such a broad statement as that it might be sufficient to say that the doctrine of mental reservation which ministers of some denominations and teachers in some of the theological seminaries declare themselves forced to adopt, is one of the most vicious of all heresies. No organization is so strong as a community of believers in the truths which exalt man. They comfort one another with the truths which they hold to be firmly established. A faith that cannot find unambiguous expression in words, and words which others who hold that faith can adopt, is no faith at all. Men will no doubt in the face of the unreasoning clamor against such mental and spiritual procedure, continue to formulate creeds, finding great comfort in them and comforting many with them. The assailants of the creedal principle in the name of liberty of opinion and freedom of teaching, deceive only themselves. There is no rational man living who does not have a creed, for he can not be rational and be without one. No truly religious life can be lived without some conception of God, some conception of the character and work of Christ and the teaching of the Scrip-These are not only to be subjectively contemplated but intelligently expressed. Because that expression has been carefully articulated is no ground for believing that a man has sold himself to accept a class of outworn beliefs and placed himself under some form of ecclesiastical tyranny. If a man says that he believes in God, he has a creed. If he says that he does not believe in God, he has a creed. It is only the difference between a negative and an affirmative creed. The man who indulges himself in cudgeling the affirmation of his neighbor, frequently, upon inquiry, is found to have the stoutest and most dogmatic kind of a negative creed. The so-called creedless churches, when their leaders are questioned, are simply found affirming other beliefs as opposed to those of what are known as the creed holding churches. Creedless men are usually forceless men, and creedless churches have no great place as factors in the progress of the kingdom of God on this earth. What is a creed? It is well to understand some things that a creed is not. It is not for example a treatise on theology. It is not something that supercedes the Bible or is even co-ordinate with it. tude of the Reformers sets forth its true idea and place. The Roman Catholic Church claimed for itself an infallible authority in the interpretation of the Scriptures, solely upon the indorsement of the Church. The Reformers, on the other hand, set forth in definite statements what they believed to be the teaching of God's Word, and offered always and persistently to appeal to that Word in defense of their doctrine. This was the essence of their protest against the usurpations of the Church of Rome. No such advocate of a creed and its place will ever coordinate it with the Bible or make of it something else than it really is, a human exposition of what the Bible teaches; what the mind of the Church has come through painstaking study and the enlightenment of the Holy Ghost, to regard as the teaching of the Bible. There is no point of contention between the Word of God and the creed. That is sometimes manifest between the tried and proved faith of the collective body of God's people. and the sporadic and ephemeral judgments of private individuals.

The attitude expressed in the latest of the Lutheran symbolical writings, viz, the Formula of Concord, may be said to express the truly Protestant view of the relation of the creed to the Scriptures. "We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing less than the prophetic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments." "Other writings of ancient and modern teachers, whatever reputation they may have, should not be regarded as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but should altogether be subordinated to them, and should not be received other or further than as witnesses, in what manner and at what places, since the time of the apostles, the doctrine of the prophets and apostles was preserved." "Other symbols and writings are not judges as are the Holy Scriptures, but only a witness and declaration of the faith, as to how at any time the Holy Scriptures have been understood and explained in the articles in controversy in the Church of God, by those who then lived, and how the opposite dogma was rejected and condemned."

The creed then means doctrine drawn from the Scriptures, as it is held and uttered by the believer. In any earnest effort to take in and appropriate the teachings of the Bible one of the very first steps, is to put the meaning as we understand it, into our own words. As held and expressed by the believer and the Church the creed is formally human. It is the human response to the divine voice. It is the formulated apprehension of the divine message, the human confession of the divine gift. Bible is what God gave to men, what came to us through holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. creed is what we understand the Bible to teach, what men mean and what the Church, the body of Christ on this earth means. One of the great writers of the Church has expressed it thus: "When the Church sets forth a collective utterance on doctrine, she is to be understood as setting forth in her own language what she judges with a common consent to be the teaching of Revelation." Consent and harmony in the faith, under the teaching of the same Spirit is one of the important forms of Christian fellowship. The consciousness of agreement with a multitude of other believers gives to the mind its own peculiar confirmation. "The testimony of the Church according to Protestant principles," as has been said, "is not the rule of faith. Yet in regard to all these doctrines which explicate and determine particularly how the great objects of faith are understood, we take firm possession by taking joint possession, by testing the movement of our own mind against that of others. We must fully realize our own meaning, by realizing it in fellowship, not necessarily with every believer, but at least with some believers."

The Church is a teaching institution and one of her functions is to provide for the information and training, in the truths of the Scriptures, of her disciples and catechumens. She is also a proclaiming institution having to make known to the world what she understands by the message entrusted to her by the Head of the Church. She owes it to herself, to her members, to other believers who do not share in her particular apprehension of the Gospel and to the world without to convey correct and

full expression of what she believes. In view of such obligations the right of the Church as an organized society to have a mind regarding the great truths contained in the Scriptures, to express that mind and exhibit that mind, can hardly be disputed. A statement so produced is a church creed. It is one of the most legitimate and important functions to which the Church can address itself.

And after all that may be said the churches and the men who have made and have held to affirmative creeds, and held them strongly, have moved the world of unregenerate man and turned them from evil to good lives. They are the churches and men which have influenced and made civilization.

The use and the necessity for such standards of faith, such accredited expressions of the Church faith, have been demonstrated in the experience of all the Christian ages. Their ground of existence and utility are manifest for all thoughtful men. They mark, disseminate and preserve the attainments made in the knowledge of Christian truth by any particular branch of the Church of Christ. They distinguish the truth from the glosses of false teachers, and present it in its integrity and due proportion. They constitute the basis of ecclesiastical fellowship among those who have reached such a common apprehension of the truth as will enable them to labor together in harmony. They are instruments in the great work of popular education.

Dr. Philip Schaff, who has written the great work on the Creeds of Christendom, gives us a brief and comprehensive summary of the place and utility of the creed in these words: "Creeds are summaries of the doctrines of the Bible, aids to its sound understanding, bonds of union among their professors, public standards, and guards against false doctrine and practice. In the form of catechisms they are of especial use in the instruction of children, and facilitate a solid and substantial religious education, in distinction from spasmodic and superficial excitement. Catechisms, liturgies and hymn books are creeds also so far as they embody doctrine."

Resting on the basis of this definition of the place of the creed, certainly no right-thinking man is going to take refuge in order to become a latitudinarian in such a phrase, for example, as this,

"the substance of doctrine," which every man is left to enlarge or diminish at his own discretion. By the "system of doctrine" is very clearly meant the doctrines of the system.

The creed is not useful only as a safeguard against error in doctrine in the ministry. It has an immense educational value for the Church as well. It is a compact expression of theology, of morals and of Church instruction. The study of the creed of any particular Church by the ministers of that Church will clarify and enlarge their views, not only as to the position of their own Church, but as to the truth, whose pillar and ground is the holy Church universal. It will tend to make their preaching clear, explicit and positive. It will suggest not only doctrinal but practical subjects for preaching, and furnish material for Scripture exposition, which is the very best style of preaching.

As well talk of the medical profession without medical science, or the cultivation of the soil without the science of agriculture, or the building of bridges without the science of engineering, as talk of intelligent religion that is creedless. As a rule the men who pretend to have no creed or to occupy an attitude of indifference toward one confessed, honor the narrowest of creeds. A creedless man is a religious weather-vane, the plaything of all the currents of human speculation. To bring people into a church without a creed is to build upon the sand and invite an early and deserved dissolution. This is fundamental to a church of any order because it is supposed to formulate, defend, and teach the truth. It is responsible for what shall be taught and its corporate judgment is superior to that of any individual within its borders.

This brings us to the crucial point in this discussion, viz, the relation of the accredited teachers of the Church in pulpit and school to the doctrines of the Church as set forth in its creedal statements. Now freedom, liberty, the right of private judgment are all terms that appeal strongly to Americans. The spirit of democracy dominant in our life as a people makes for individual responsibility and self-direction.. Our history is the exaltation of the principle of freedom. It is not strange, therefore, that the right of the individual to decide for himself in matters of religious faith is strenuously asserted. But freedom

of thought and expression is something more than a theory sanctioned by our national antecedents and history, it is a condition of religious progress. Few would claim that scholarship has no function save to affirm the results of past investigation. Robinson, the able leader of the Leyden dissenters, a name famous in the story of the Plymouth Pilgrims, said a great thing in this "the Lord hath more truth and light to break forth from His holy word." Protestantism has no disposition to declare all investigation closed, to bid men study the revelation God has given and to deny them the privilege of announcing what they have found. But investigation and research in the religious sphere particularly are carried on for the most part by men who represent certain religious faiths. These men are not only religious men, but they are Christian men; and not only Christians but Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopa-They are not unattached Christians or teachers. Were they free lances in the field of Christian truth there would be no problem regarding the freedom of teaching. But being as they are the representatives of religious bodies which stand for definite interpretations of the Scriptures, for a particular apprehension of the teachings of the New Testament, exercising the functions of their teaching office in pulpits of a particular order, or in denominational schools, having under their instruction young men who are in their turn to become teachers in particular religious bodies, the question arises how far may they depart from the denominational standards and still be permitted to retain their positions? To put the question even less abstractly: "Should a Lutheran teacher in a Lutheran school be permitted to teach whatever he will?" Is the Church to place men in important teaching positions and then share in no responsibility for them? Is it the understanding that he is to teach what at the time he thinks to be true, whether it be according to David Hume, Christian Baur, Albrecht Ritschl or Adolf Harnach? Our answer to such questions must be an emphatic nega-There is to be freedom of teaching, but with qualifications The freedom may be absolute when the teacher represents only himself. It is the unquestioned privilege of any man to propound, advocate and enlist disciples to the standard of any religious vagary when he stands out in the open and is independent and unattached. But when attached, he assumes to represent the body of Christians with which he is voluntarily aligned and which has honored him with a responsible position.

President Hyde of Bowdoin College seems to have worked himself into an unwarranted state of mental agitation when in his sermon at the inauguration of the president of a western university, he declared that "for bishop or minister, or trustee or pious layman to interfere with a competent university professor on theological grounds is as wanton and brutal an act as it would be for a prize fighter to step into the pulpit and knock down the minister because he happened to have the bigger fist." All of which proves that so competent a man as President Hyde may not see some things very evident to the average man. And one of these things is this, that if a church has founded a university in the interests of the evangelical faith, it is dishonest to use its funds in the interests of an opposite faith. The most competent professors certainly ought to have such and so much honor as is common among men of the street, men who do not accept a salary from an enterprise they are seeking to destroy. It is not entirely plain why a "competent university professor" should enjoy liberty not enjoyed by other men. Every man is at liberty in this country to teach about what he wills to teach, but not to use trust funds for other purposes than those of the donors who supplied the funds.

Not long before his death Professor Allen of the Cambridge Episcopal Divinity School issued a book under the title, "Freedom in the Church." Its object was to vindicate for the ministry and laity too, of the Episcopal Church in this country, a large liberty of belief, especially with regard to the articles of the Apostles' Creed, and more especially still with respect to that particular article which declares that our Lord was "born of the virgin Mary." Its method is historical, advancing considerations which seem designed to show that the Church of England, and by inference her daughter, the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, has never bound herself to a system of truth, but in all her deliverances in which she may at first sight seem to do so is really asserting her freedom from systems of truth. This able historian was himself sound on the virgin birth of our

Lord and His resurrection. But in his book he tried, as it seems to us with sometimes specious and entirely inadequate arguments, to make a place in the Protestant Episcopal Church for men who refuse to accept the fundamental facts of the Apostles' Creed. "Religion," said Prof. Allen, "has its own laws, it is guided by deep motives, which only those interested, or as it were, observed by them can understand." On that basis he would let any man that he thought religious, believe anything he pleased notwithstanding he had to lead in the recital of the apostles' and other creeds of the Church. On the learned professor's position at the time of its announcement the New York Evening Post said this:

"The question would seem to be as to what function the reciter of the creed is supposed to fulfill. If he is a celebrant of mysteries, common judgment on the meaning of the offices he employs may be disregarded. If he is regarded as an historian or theologian, he may be allowed to quote ancient formularies in a sense known only to himself. But if the minister is a teacher, and, in reciting the creed, a leader in an intelligent act of worship, it is difficult to see how Professor Allen's claim of the privilege of employing the creed in an esoteric sense can be allowed."

Thus it may be seen how that allegiance to his own conscience absolves a man from allegiance to his own conscience in promising to "administer the doctrine and sacraments and discipline of Christ as this Church hath received the same" which is the formula for ordination in the Episcopal Church. Such confusion as this in regard to the obligation of truthfulness would make honest intercourse impossible among the children of this world. It is not a little astonishing what twists the ethical standards of men are subjected to when they have first twisted their understandings. "We have been pestered for a generation with the monstrosity of an undogmatic religion," says Prof. Warfield of Princeton, who further asks the question, "Are we to be pestered now with an 'unethical religion?"

It is indeed somewhat peculiar that just at a time when there is so much of an outcry against anarchy in the State, there should be so much that borders closely upon it in the sphere of religion. The determination to throw off all authority in this

sphere seems to grow with what it feeds upon. Creeds must have no authority, the consensus of opinion that has been reached after centuries of conflict for the truth must have no authority; beliefs which have made epochs and produced generations of heroic men and women must have no authority, the mighty men of the past who have changed the face of the world have no authority, the lawgivers of Israel must have no authority, nor the prophets, nor the apostles, nor Jesus himself, except such as belongs to other sages, nor the Bible; nothing must have authority excepting the opinion of the man expressing it, and he must be accorded the privilege of changing his opinion before sunset of the same day.

But notwithstanding all that may be alleged in the name of freedom in teaching, and much that has gained wide recognition in certain quarters, it comes within the scope and limitations of the Church's authority to impose certain restrictions upon its accredited and authorized teachers. Free thinking in religion is not necessarily unregulated thinking. The right to private judgment is as sacred and inalienable as the right to life or liberty, nevertheless it has its wholesome and necessary denominational limitations. It is a significant fact in the history of our own Church that it was rationalists, such as Sember and Bahrt, Wegscheider and Bretschneider, who first invented or acted upon the theory that a man could be a good Lutheran and at the same time in the name of freedom, assail the doctrines of the Church. In the Book of Concord, Vol. II, p. 13, Jacob's edition), it is said "Symbols are not to be subscribed until, as a result of careful study and comparison with God's Word, they are recognized and cheerfully declared to be drawn from the pure fountains of Israel. This is a quia subscription. On the other hand we have what is known in the study of symbolics as the quaterus subscription which means that a creed is accepted "in so far as it is in accord with the Bible." The Church has. of course, a right and as a matter of fact does demand a quia subscription to its credal statements, i. e., because these statements agree with the Scriptures. The other form it can be seen at once is evasive and delusive. In making such a subscription a man does not renounce his right of private judgment. If a man, for example, is a Lutheran, it is presupposed that he has reached the Lutheran faith by a free and devout study of the Scriptures, that it has not been imposed upon his conscience by external constraints, and that he gladly proclaims his purpose to preach or teach that faith because he heartily believes it to be in accord with the Word of God.

We subscribe to the Augsburg Confession because we believe that the doctrines therein set forth are certainly taught in the Scriptures, and all that we as Lutherans ask is, that if a man's private judgment of the Word of God does not lead him to the belief that the doctrines set forth in our great church confession are taught in the Scriptures that he shall not pretend to be a Lutheran and use the name of a great Church as his shelter in undermining the faith of such as are committed to her spiritual care.

A man may come in all honesty, to hold views that contravene those of his denomination. His right to change his faith and to announce his more recent belief, are unquestioned; but that he should continue as the representative of a body which he does not represent, be supported in teaching that which, if generally accepted, would wipe the denomination from the ecclesiastical map, is equally preposterous. To ask of a religious denomination that it permit unrestricted teaching in its pulpits or schools, is to ask for that which even the State will not grant. Instructors in State institutions are free to investigate and free to teach; but their freedom to teach is conditioned by the State's' own verdict as to the truth of that which is taught. The teacher may not declare with impunity that which contradicts the convictions of those employing him. Absolute and unqualified liberty to teach anything and everything is not granted by any educational institution on the face of the earth. There are schools which give wider latitude than others, but all have a frontier somewhere which may not be passed over. Considering now the importance of the place of religion, that upon it the foundations of society repose, that it is not to be dissociated from sound ethical standards, that in it are rooted the most powerful moral sanctions and that it inspires our fondest hopes, surely here if anywhere the Church, the administrator of religion, has the right to insist that teaching, done in its name, shall not contravene the ends for which it was established. Freedom of teaching cannot safely include liberty to declare that which contradicts the propositions upon which a denomination of Christians has been builded up. Academic freedom is of less importance than truth, and for the Church to permit the teaching in its name of that which it believes to be untrue is not generosity and breadth, but unwise devotion to an impossible ideal. Liberty then in an educational institution, like liberty everywhere else, must be properly used and not abused. Teachers should not be put in the rich man's case on the one hand, or be given the license of unregulated freedom on the other hand. The heady valuation of a man's own opinions and their declaration are not to be set above all the rights and interests of an institution or the body of Christians with which he may be allied. If he feels that he must speak the new things which he has found by all means let him speak with all the force which his personality and wisdom can give to his words. But let him not seek to clothe his words with another and greater authority which has not been entrusted to him for any such purpose.

The subject under consideration, therefore, has also its ethical aspect. It is indeed one of the all but inexplicable mysteries with which we are confronted in our day that, when a Church sets apart men to preach in her pulpits and teach in her college and seminary chairs, to maintain and defend her doctrines, not a few are found eager to enter her service, pledge their loyalty to her principles, and accept her pecuniary support, but who do not scruple afterwards to labor to bring into discredit the very principles they profess to have accepted, and for the promulgation of which they had engaged to give their lives. Accordingly we read of a man who has found himself out of harmony with the standards of the Church in which he has been serving, and that he has retired from a relationship which he can no longer conscientiously sustain. But more frequently do we find ministers who have departed from the standards of their Church, who continue under that church's sheltering roof, and, taking advantage of their position, assail her doctrines and seeking to lead people who have been entrusted to their tutelage into their own heretical attitude. The ethical character of such a course has, and always will be a puzzle in casuistry. A man of high standing in English religious circles is reported to have given this counsel to a young "candidate for orders," and whose conscience was troubling him in the matter of signing the thirty-nine articles, when his subscription would be unaccompanied by belief, that "we must not lose our usefulness for the sake of scruples." So common indeed was this kind of subscription at one time that Thomas Moore, the Irish poet, humorously touched it off with this couplet:

"Our great thirty-nine

Was never thus written to believe

But to sign."

At the time of the appearance of Prof. Cheyne's radical "Encyclopedia Biblica," under the caption, "The Bible in Tatters," Dr. Robertson Nicoll, editor of the British Weekly, thus trenchantly wrote of the Professor, who is a minister of the Church of England, as well as an Oxford professor:

"The mythologizing critic of the future will never believe that the man who is so zealous for righteousness, and so careful for truth, the man who has been forced by the evidence to deny the deity of Christ, his virgin birth, his miracles, his resurrection, who has practically found no sure record of his earthly history, actually spent three months of every year in solemn daily recital

of the creeds and prayers of the Christian Church."

To stand in an Episcopal pulpit and wilfully discredit the tenets of that communion may be lauded in the newspapers as an act of courage, and an evidence of advanced thinking, but it is certainly no indication of fair dealing. We may praise free speech in sonorous tones and rally about the standard of fraternity and tolerance, but we are certainly bound to conform as Christian men to something like sound ethical standards. There may be such a thing as honest heresy but there can be no such thing as unethical ethics or honest dishonesty. It is hard to muster up any very profound sympathy with a man whose temptations turn on the retention or sacrifice of clerical income. When he finds himself in conflict with the doctrines of a Church to which he belongs, and by which he is maintained, one would naturally say that he should seek deliverance from the bondage of the doctrines and relief of conscience by freeing himself from the obligations which bind him to support the one and consequently to violate the other. The moral aspect of the thing was expressed with epigramatic felicity by the late Episcopal Bishop-Potter, of New York, in one of his convention addresses at the time of the Crapsey trouble in his Church. The bishop said, with an eye on the sweeping distinctiveness of the erring rector's enunciations:

"It is impossible in the minds of people who hold fast to the principles of common honesty to respect either the consistency or the integrity of one who eats the Church's bread, accepts the Church's dignities, enjoys the Church's' honors and impugns the Church's faith. If he must assail her beliefs, then the dictates of ordinary uprightness would plainly seem to be that he must, first of all, withdraw from a fellowship to whose fundamental beliefs he cannot candidly assent."

There is a decidedly striking paragraph in Leckey's History of European Morals. It is this: "The great majority of ancient philosophers preached and even defended the religious rites that they despised. They satirized in the theatres the very gods that they worshipped in the temples. The belief that it is wrong for a man to sanction by his presence and example what he regards as baseless superstition had no place in the ethics of antiquity."

There is much of the same thing encountered nowadays. Creeds are accepted with mental reservation or for "substance of doctrine" only, when to say the truth, the substance is precisely what is left out in the "mental reservation." Men accept calls to churches which hold to the evangelical faith and in becoming pastors of such churches they are supposed, of course, to hold to the same faith and to subscribe to it. It is distinctly understood that this is what they are to preach and for which they get their salaries. The question is do they preach as is implied in the acceptance of a call to such a Church. As a matter of fact again some such ministers preach something else, not infrequently something fundamentally destructive of the faith for which the Church has always stood and is still supposed to stand.

Great universities claiming to be Christian and even bearing the names of evangelical Churches continue the services of professors who scout at and flout the beliefs of the denomination and sometimes go so far as to deny the deity of the Lord and Head of the Church. Now if the public has the temerity and ethical soundness to demand that the professors should either drop their teachings or forego their salaries, the professors and their friends at once raise the cry of persecution and set up the claim of liberty. But this is not liberty. It is simply what is called Pickwickian in some quarters and described as pagan by Lecky.

Contemporary writers dwell upon the hearty subscription which the school of thinkers known as the Cambridge Platonists, gave to the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England. But it was found out that this hearty subscription was very much like that which John Henry Newman gave to the same articles of belief about two centuries later, when in his famous tract No. XC, he showed that those same articles meant only what he personally wanted them to mean. Archbishop Usher said: "We do not suffer any man to reject the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England at his pleasure; yet neither do we look upon them as essentials of saving faith, or legacies of Christ and His apostles; but as pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity; neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them." This can hardly be classified other than as a species of subtle evasion. If a man in ordinary business should sign a contract in the easy going fashion in which the Platonists are said to have subscribed the articles, we should certainly know how to think of him and his conception of commercial ethics.

The Church is the defender of the truth and this right minister and teacher should respect and the Church maintain. This is its obligation to its own children and to the world. When it says in its creed "We believe and teach," upon that basis minister and teacher who voluntarily assent are expected to stand and teach or both are recreant to a sacred trust. The world is wide. There is room for every man provided every man is in his own place; but when any man gets into the place of another he ought not to cry out about suppression and persecution, if he is politely asked to vacate. There is not only bad ethics but an intolerable impertinence in the theory that it is the privilege of pastor, or teacher to remain in his position and eat the bread of the Church's own providing, until he has brought to his views those under his influence. We want no revised ecclesiastical casuistry.

The fact may be recalled that in the land of Luther, Protestants have been sorely vexed and perplexed over what is known as the "professors' question." That question has been percipitated by the fact that much of the theology taught in the universities by the men who are to prepare the coming generation of pastors and preachers, is in glaring conflict with the confessional and actual status of the congregations. There is in many cases a decided chasm between the academic theology and its liberal teachings and tendencies advocated in the name of "scientific research," by the university men and the popular faith of the average congregation. The most of the people still adhere to a belief in the inspiration and divine character of the Bible. to the divinity of our Lord, and to the plan of salvation as set forth in both the Lutheran and Reformed confessions, and they are willing to insist that their doctrinal standpoint be respected. In one of his more recent volumes Professor Adolf Harnack in treating of the "modern educational movement," speaks in a way to make one pause and think. This great German scholar seems to have become uneasy and apprehensive over the present situation and the future prospect. He quotes from Goethe the following significant remark: "Everything that sets free our intelligence without giving us self-control is fatal." "And that." says Harnack, "is a terse and striking epitome of the matter." This is striking, for no boast is so common now as that regarding the freedom of intelligence, which has been gained by modern thought. It is encountered everywhere in the discussions on theology and other great subjects. But if this increase of freedom of intelligence has not given a corresponding increase of self-control, it is "fatal" say both Goethe and Harnack. question then is this, Has the new freedom been attended with more self-control? In answering this question Harnack quotes John Stuart Mill, who says: "When the philosophic minds of the world can no longer believe its religion, or can only believe it with modifications amounting to an essential change of its character, a transitional period commences, of weak convictions, paralyzed intellects and growing laxity of principle which cannot terminate until a renovation has been effected in the basis of their belief." This the able German professor regards as "a most accurate description of the present situation." That is to say the free intelligence has not added to self-control, for "weak convictions" and "growing laxity of principle" are just the opposite of self-control. It is this that causes Prof. Harnack's uneasiness over the modern movement. There is increased freedom of intelligence, but not increased self-control, nay more, there is loss of moral conviction and principle. "This state of affairs," he says, "which has lasted so long already, this lack of faith and diversity of beliefs, is most prejudicial to all healthy progress to-day." And Dr. Harnck sees no remedy in the great emphasis which is being put upon science. "It is useless," he says, "to expect that the mere study of particular sciences can avert such a condition; for in this matter neither specialized learning nor knowledge as a whole can avail anything." Thus while it has been so constantly proclaimed that greater freedom of thought has given us a new era of marvelous progress, this great German scholar, historian, critic and theologian-and who himself has been somewhat of a free lance in these fields. sees in this very freedom a startling danger of disaster." Is it not rather significant when a great secular weekly, after adversely criticising an attempt in the Westminster Review of last June, to maintain the "individual solution" of the religious problem says; "The weakest spot in the theory is the total neglect of human nature's fundamental craving for authority in religion."

In the last analysis it comes to this, that, be the freedom of the individual what it may, it is always freedom within and as a member of a larger organism. True freedom is in conduct congruous with something outside of and higher than myeslf. I have freedom in bonds but not freedom from bonds.

Springfield, Ohio.

## ARTICLE IV.

## PREACHING CHRIST CRUCIFIED.

BY PROFESSOR LUTHER A. FOX, D.D.

St. Paul's discourse on Mars Hill in style and method was formed upon the model of the philosophic lectures of that day. It was a masterly address. The more carefully we study the brief summary as given in Acts the more profoundly we are impressed with the wonderful skill he displayed in adjusting himself to the audience by which he was surrounded. He speaks to philosophers, degenerate pupils of the great teachers, but still proud of their lofty plane of thought and refinement of speech. St. Paul knew the difficulties that beset him, how foreign his message would be to all their former ideas and with what suspicions they regarded him as an itinerant Jew. He conciliates them by complimenting their city and especially their deep interest in religion. He removes their fears that he was an apostle of some new deity. He surprises them by announcing that he had come to speak of that Supreme Being of whom Plato and Aristotle and Zeno had written. He showed himself acquainted with their literature by quoting from one of their poets. He awakens the attention of the Epicureans by saying that God does not dwell in temples and that He needs nothing at our hands. The Stoic was aroused when he said that God is not far away from us and indifferent to us, for we live and move and have our being in Him. We are His offspring, and a true worship rises far above the idolatry with which the city abounded. Up to this point they must have been very much impressed. It was something new in that place to hear anything about repentance or a righteousness other than that of which their philosophers had written. At last he comes to the main part of his discussion and he announced the name of Jesus Christ, proven to be God's greatest interpreter by the fact that He was raised from the dead. The doctrine seemed ridiculous, and with derision the audience went away. Only two were converted to Christianity. One does not see how St. Paul could have spoken in any other way than he

did, or how an address could have been better adapted to the conditions under which it was made than that on Mars Hill. But he was disappointed by the results. It was the only one of that kind he ever delivered. He returned immediately to his old method. He went to Corinth, the metropolis of the province and a great commercial center. It was less scholastic but not less refined in literary taste than Athens. Here he discarded philosophy and arguments founded upon metaphysics. He realized more fully than ever before that philosophy and religion have different aims and must employ different methods. He became more indifferent to the refinements of oratory. "When I came among you to declare the testimony of God I came not with any surpassing skill in eloquence or philosophy. And when I proclaimed my message I used not the persuasive arguments of human wisdom but showed forth by sure proofs the power of the Holy Spirit that your faith might have its foundation, not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. The Jews seek a miracle and the Greeks seek philosophy, but I preached Christ and Him crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness but to us Christians the wisdom of God and the power of God."

The pulpit of to-day is trying a great many methods to draw the masses. All kinds of subjects are discussed—scientific, ethical, aesthetic, political, sociological, economic, literary, educational, charitable, and one hardly knows how many others. A great many auxilliary things are employed to attract large audiences. The services are made as entertaining as the pastors can devise. But there is a general cry that the churches are losing their hold on the people. It is not strange, because they are losing their distinctive character and are becoming literary and social clubs disguised under the name of religion. The pulpit fails to interest because it has abandoned its proper sphere and undertakes to rival the platform and the stage. It would do well to study the lesson St. Paul learned at Athens and try his method of preaching Christ crucified. But that is often misunderstood and it is worth while to stop and consider its meaning.

1. Christ crucified is the most fundamental principle in Christianity. Christ's life is a great historic fact. It has exerted an exceedingly great influence in the world. Mr. Lecky

said that "the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to soften and regenerate mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists." The influence has gone into every department of life. It has grown with the ages and seems to be about to achieve its greatest victories. European and American civilization, if not created by it, has been so vitalized and ennobled as to be truly called its child. The power of that life is due to its perfection. It is the embodiment of the highest ideals of human character. Christ stands out in history as the only perfect man. Renan admits that whatever the future may bring this perfection can never be surpassed. In Him the divine and the human came into closest touch. He is a manifestation of the divine in the sphere of humanity. Those who deny His divine nature accept as true what He said of Himself, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." If there is any possible fellowship between God and men, in Him it was realized. This is becoming more and more manifest and is increasing the interest of philosophic thinkers in His wonderful personality. Unitarian thought may be spreading but there has never been a more earnest attention given to the problems of His person and life than at the present time. It is being more clearly seen than ever before that Christ is involved in the great problems of this world.

Until recently philosophy from the time of Thales always began its speculations with certain a priori conceptions of the infinite, or of some absolutely self-originated principles. Systems of theology have been largely influenced by the dominant philosophy at the time they were formed. But if we take our starting point in God we can never find a satisfactory explanation of the fact of the world. God is absolute and there is no need of a universe; He is infinite and there is no place for it. An absolute God can not enter into relations outside of Himself, and an infinite God must include all reality, therefore the universe must be a part of God. God is eternally and perfectly happy. He is infinitely self-contained and does not need a universe to increase His happiness or glory. Why then, did He make it? The Pantheist answers that the universe itself is the eternal God.

As an infinite being God is absolute sovereign, The world is just what He wished to make it. Nothing can occur in it but what He decrees. God's will is not only supreme but also the only efficient power in the universe. It is absolutely exclusive of every independent agency. There is, therefore, no place for free will, and none for sin. No matter how much we shrink from the conclusion our premise of absolute sovereignty compels us to say that God decrees sin, is the efficient cause of sin, and therefore there is no sin. If God's will is absolute, and if only a part of the race will be saved there is an arbitrary election. All children who die before the age of accountability are elect, or there are children in hell. No Calvinist today will accept these conclusions because no one holds the unmodified premises which were laid down by Augustine and Calvin.

If we begin with the abstract conception of God we can never prove His existence. Anselm and Descartes only proved the logical consistency of the idea but not the truth of the objective reality. Spinoza reached pantheism. The current philosophy is either pantheistic or atheistic. These are some of the consequences of a logic that tries to reach the meaning of the world by abstract conceptions of God. We are left with a God without a universe or a universe without a God.

But if we take our starting point with man we can prove that God exists. No matter how man came into existence, whether by evolution or immediate creation, he did not make himself. The world in which he lives had a beginning, and through whatever process of evolution it may have passed, it rests at last upon eternal and infinite being. There is nothing in the effect that was not in its cause. The world, then, is a revelation of God. We are persons and God is either a person or something greater than personality. We have an innate sense of responsibility to our Maker and responsibility can not exist except between persons. We are under a moral law and have free wills, or law is meaningless. God, the ground of that law, is infinitely holy. We are conscious of our sinfulness, and as the cause of sin can not be in our Maker it must lie in the universe of our own wills. We have the idea of justice and whence could it have come, but from a just God. We have aspirations after God but we can not lift ourselves up into a likeness of Him. A sense, not of finiteness, but of guilt separates us from Him. We grope in the darkness but cannot find God though He is not far from us. If the breach is not to be eternal God must in some way reveal Himself to us and bring us into fellowship with Himself. These are facts as certain as any found in nature. Our advanced science tells a great many new things about God's laws and methods in the physical and psychical world, but it has not a word more than the old about the reasons for this alien action and the means of reconciliation with God. Our sins must be forgiven and a new divine life imparted to us or the deepest longing of the human heart will forever be unsatisfied. Why this great chasm between man and God, this ceaseless search after a way to peace, this longing after a better life? What is the meaning of our nature? Christ crucified is the only satisfactory answer. If Christ is God manifest in a human nature His cross brought the forgiveness of sin, the power of a new life and personal union with God. He is the revelation of the divine justice and love. In Him God and men are brought together. He is the explanation of God's purpose in creating a world exposed to sin and suffering. He is the solution of the great problems of supreme and vital importance in morals and religion. Christ crucified is of great cosmic significance, the great central principles of a true philosophy of religion. In living touch with that great fact the preacher may discuss in his pulpit every question that has bearing upon the intellectual, moral, social and religious life of the people. Held steadily under its light there is nothing belonging to men foreign from his work.

Christ crucified is not merely a great historic fact but as a truth it is also a fundamental doctrine in the Christian system of theology. It stands in logical connection with everyother Christian doctrine. The great central truth is not God's sovereignty, nor man's needs, nor the nature of the sacraments, nor the kingdom of God, nor even justification by faith, but Christ crucified. This is what St. Paul meant when he said that he had determined not to preach anything else and that he gloried only in the cross of Christ. As a matter of fact he did preach all the chief doctrines of the Christian faith and set forth all the great duties of the Christian life, but always in relation to Christ's death. Every truth and duty gets its highest and truest meaning and fullest force from the cross.

There is much said in the present day about holding to Christ

instead of creeds. Dogmas are sneered at and confessions are denounced. It seems plausible, but is really absurd. It could find currency only in a shallow, superficial age. We get indignant at the efforts made by men who claim to have outgrown St. Paul and St. John, and who try to justify themselves by exalting the pure life of our Lord as revealing the possiblities of men in a Godlike character. They deride theologians and theology but profess to believe in Christ. But who was Christ? Was He a mere man? Was He absolutely perfect, or did He have human frailities which at last He overcame? Was He simply a great teacher and the highest exemplar, or did He speak with the auhtority of God? Was He the highly gifted son of Joseph and Mary who raised Himself farther up towards God than any other man has ever done, or was He God incarnate? Does His influence merely survive Him, or does His real personal presence remain with His people? We must have some definite and positive notion about Him or Christ is nothing more than a vague indeterminate name. We must have a creed if we think at all about religious things. If we say that Christ is God why is that any more a dogma than if we say that He was merely a man. The cry against creeds and dogmas is after all not so much against them as such as against the ideas they express. If one is denied recognition by the Church because he believes that Christ was simply a man why is that any more persecution and illiberality and dogmatism than when one is denied recognition in scientific circles because he believes in the Nicene Creed? The rule ought to work both ways.

If Christ is not true God as well as true man Christianity may not be the final religion, Christ's word may not be ultimate, His life may not be the highest expression of the divine under human conditions, and our holy religion is infinitely poorer than we have been accustomed to regard it. The death of our Lord was splendid as a martyrdom, but in no sense an atonement. The cross was an admirable example of a good man's devotion to God, but not an evidence of God's love for us. The precious words, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son," are shorn of their meaning. He is only an extraordinary genius, but not infallible, an illustration of how high man may lift himself towards the Godlike but not a revelation of how

close God may come to us. We asked for bread, but here is only a stone. If Christ is not very God of very God Christianity is somewhat better than any of the others but is only one of the ethnic religions, and our Saviour is a man of larger intuitions but stands on the same plane with Buddah, Confucius, Mohammed, and even of Newton and Darwin. We can not preach Christ crucified in the fulness of its meaning without preaching the doctrine of his person. Here not one inch can be yielded.

If He was God the doctrine of the Trinity is true. Monistic philosophy pronounces this doctrine an absurdity, a relapse into idolatry. It is said that Christ never claimed to be God and that Paul is responsible for the dogma. It has become popular to reject the Nicene Creed and to speak in contemptuous terms of the Athanasian. If it were true, as Beyschlag and others assert. that there is not a single genuine saying of Christ found in the Synoptics laying claim to a divine nature, it is nevertheless a fact that the doctrine of the Trinity is the logical consequence of Christ's teaching. St. Paul and St. John merely drew the necessary inferences. As soon as Christians began to think what was involved in Christ's life and words they could not help formulating their conclusions in some such terms as the Nicene Creed. If we would heed the call "back to Christ," unless we would suppress at the same time all deeper study of His religion, we would soon came back to the doctrines of the Nicene Fathers. The doctrine of the Trinity is a mystery but it is not an absurdity. We cannot repudiate it without surrendering every thing that is essential in Christianity.

St. Paul made Christ crucified the great center of all truth. He found it in the law, in the prophets, in the history, in the Psalms, in the temples, and in the ritual. If He preached about heaven it was as living with Christ, of hell it was as banishment from His presence, of baptism it was as putting on Christ, of the eucharist it was a communion of His body and blood, of the Church it was as the body of Christ, and of the consummation of the world it was as the coming of Christ to judgment. He looked at life and the world solely in their relations to the cross.

To be faithful to the Apostolic principles it is not necessary that every sermon should be on the plan of salvation. A discourse may be truly evangelical even though the name of Christ is not mentioned. It would be preposterous to try to make every sermon so full of Christ that a man who had never heard one before, might learn enough to be saved. To those who have learned the multiplication table we do not repeat it in every lesson in mathematics. In the book of Hebrews we are directed to leave the first principles and go on to perfection. But we must have Christ so dominantly in our hearts that every sermon has its roots in Him. Every truth must be set out in the light in which it has been learned through Him. The standpoint from which we view a doctrine or duty makes a radical difference. The rationalist preaches a Christ but he is not our crucified Christ. The moralist preaches repentance but it is not that godly contrition that comes from a vision of the cross. Even justification by faith and holy living mean very different things on the lips of different preachers. Doctrinal sermons in vital touch with Christ crucified and brought into relation with real life are always interesting and effective. Only abstract treatment is tedious and irksome to our congregations.

2. We must preach Christ crucified as the source of spiritual life. Christianity is not so much a creed as a life. The creed is a summary of the principles of Christian living. The creed as a mere matter of intellect is dead, but the life without the creed is impossible. As Christ crucified is the center of a true creed He is the source of all right living. He is apprehended only through the creed and when we are brought into personal relation to Him He sends His own life into our lives and transforms them. As long as we believe with a living faith in a true creed He lives in us and we live through Him. "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in Me."

Spiritual life is a peculiar kind of life. It is neither moral life nor rational life but a life higher than either, yet in relation to both. It is not mere moral life, for a great many men have been of irreproachable character according to civil and social standards who laid no claim to personal piety. It is not simple intellectual life, for among the greatest philosophers there have been many who did not profess to be Christians. We can not define natural life. We know only its instruments and effects. It is just as impossible to define spiritual life. But we know its source. It is begotten in us through a personal relation to

Christ. We know also its effects. It produces a peculiar form of character. It reveals itself by such special activities that we are never in doubt about its presence. One who does not possess it can not understand it any better than a blind man can understand colors, or a brute abstract truths. But what it is in itself we can not tell.

There is no true religion without this life in Christ. There may be religious forms, religious creeds, religious feelings and religious ceremonies, but without this spiritual life they do not constitute religion. Much of our religious work to-day is without spiritual power. Much of our religion is a mere religionness similar in nature to that which St. Paul condemns in Athens while complimenting the interest his audience had taken in religious subjects. We make many church members without making them Christians. We swell our congregations without adding proportionately to the number of saints. We have introduced alien methods and neglected the simple preaching of the Gospel. We have appealed to reason, to social interests, to material gains, to temporal hopes and fears, to all kinds of earthly motives to bring men into the Church instead of preaching Christ the wisdom and power of God. We have tried more to attract to our services than to save men. We have lacked faith in God's power to carry on his own work and we have tried to help Him by our ingenious schemes. If Christ crucified does not draw men the minister has nothing more to do than our Lord had when He wept over Jerusalem.

Vital godliness is often misunderstood. Religious emotionalism has been mistaken for it. People who have lively emotions, who revel in the religious excitement of revivals, who shed tears, who pray vehemently, are thought in some sections of the Church to be in the exclusive posession of living piety. But religion is not primarily a feeling; it is a faith. There is feeling in all forms of human life, but the feeling is not the cause of life. Life is the ground of feeling. Where life is strongest there is the least direct consciousness of feeling. The healthy vigorous boy whose buoyant life runs out into ceaseless activity does not think much about his feelings. He is concerned about room for the play of his exuberant energy. If he sat down to inspect his feelings he would soon become morbid. Disordered life only be-

comes strongly conscious of its feeling. It is the sick man who studies and talks about his feelings. So those people who think and talk about their emotions are at best morbid Christians. Their religion is subjective, and when there is no true object there can be only a false subject. They trust in their own feelings instead of God's promises. Christ's name is a wand by which they conjure up ecstatic states. Such sensationalism is not so common even in our rural districts as it was some years ago but it still lingers wherever an emotional revivalism is found. The professional revivalist plays with the merely human emotions and reports hundreds of converts but in a little while very few of them remain faithful. A living piety lays hold on something deeper than the emotions. It is a principle that controls life and moulds character. It makes Christians of deep convictions who are steadfast in duty, patient and brave in suffering, and firm and unyielding in temptation.

Extremes follow each other. Empiricism in philosophy is succeeded by Idealism. The cold rationalism of Kant was followed by the pantheistic sentimentalism of Schliermacher. The sensationalism of the first half of the last century is giving way to a sentimental aestheticism of the preesnt. We are emphasizing beauty in church architecture, in music and in the liturgical service. There is beauty in holiness, but beauty is not holiness. The music in the service of song may be so beautiful that we miss altogether the worship. The rendering of the liturgy may be so attractive that the spirit of devotion escapes us. Religious aestheticism is always formalism. Often piety is more vigorous in a modest little chapel than in the magnificent temple. Splendid churches, grand music and a choice ritual may be helps but they cannot be substitutes for Christ. We must guard against the strong tendency towards ritualism by a stronger, clearer and more earnest foundation of the supreme importance of a life hid with Christ in God.

3. Christ crucified is the only ground of the highest virtue. Morality and religion however closely related are not identical. But much of our modern religious thought confuses them, and some of our present day preaching is little more than mere moralizing. It is said, after Tolstoi, that Christianity is summed up in the Sermon on the Mount. A city pastor averred that

he was trying only to get his people to live more decently because "that is the whole of Christianity anyhow." The Church is regarded simply as a school of reform. Every man of respectable moral character is a Christian. No matter what a man believes, if he pays his debts, is not a habitual drunkard or libertine, is kind to the poor and is not illiberal towards sceptics, he will be saved. Seneca and Epictetus were inspired as well as Paul, and philosophic ethics is as good as Christian ethics. Such false conceptions are wide-spread. They are plausible because of an element of truth. Truly religious people are always moral. But we are not Christians because we are moral, but we are moral because we are Christians.

There is a great difference between natural and Christian morality. Philosophic and Christian ethics have much in common, just as philosophy and religion, but they are radically dif-They differ in the conception of the ground of obligation. Scientific Hedonism has no place for the word "ought." Rationalistic Intuitionalism finds obligation in the dignity of reason. Christian ethics places it in our relation to God. They differ also in their prime motive. Hedonism can find no higher motive than personal happiness or at most the general happiness of mankind. Hence it is based on feeling as the prime element in man to which reason is subordinate. Intuitionalism finds the all controlling motive in a sense of duty for duty's sake. That is the grandest conception that philosophy can reach. Christian ethics finds the dominant motive in love for God. In this supreme love there is a rational spontaneity that constitutes the truest liberty. Here religion and morality become identical. Love for God, the infinitely holy Father, is an immeasureably higher motive than a selfish desire for personal happiness, broader and worthier than a regard for mankind, and nobler and better than a sense of duty. It includes everything good in all other motives and mounts to a place very far above them. Virtue founded upon the love of God is the highest possible for man. The character inspired by that love is the most exalted that we can conceive. Christianity, then, stands for a morality that is fundamentally different from that of philosophic ethics. We love God because He first loved us, and He manifested that love towards us in its fulness when in the person of Christ He laid down His life for us.

Christian ethics has its chief pre-eminence in its spiritual power No matter how clearly and fully philosophic ethics may lay down right precepts it must leave the results to natural influences. How inadequate they are the moral history of the world abundantly proves. "I see and approve the better but follow the worse," is the universal lament. But Christianity has a It regenerates. It reaches and renews transforming power. the sources of character. It not only points out the right path, but gives the power of walking in it. Here the prayer is answered, "Create in me a clean heart and renew a right spirit within me." God works in us the will and power to do what He commands. This distinguishes the Church from the Lodge. Nothing but Christianity can justly claim the power of making us new creatures. By preaching Christ crucified we offer a basis for the purest, noblest and best character that is possible for us under the conditions of our present life.

The Christian minister as a citizen should co-operate in all just efforts for moral reform. He should work for the suppression of drinking and gambling saloons and brothels, just as he seeks to secure better sanitation and better schools. He may be a member of moral associations just as he may be of a literary club. He should try to bring to bear upon his fellow citizens those moral influences that make men socially decent and respectable. In these efforts there is no more a compromise of the claims of his ministerial office than in his voting in civil elections or in doing anything looking to the promotion of the material or civic welfare of his community. But the minister should never forget that the civil law can never make men morally good according to Christian standards. In his pulpit he is doing a more radical work than any that is within the possibilities of the State. If he can inspire men with the love of Christ he makes them good citizens, good neighbors, good men, because the root of all virtue is planted in the very center of life.

4. Christ crucified is the inspiration of a true benevolence. Our Lord commands us to seek first the kingdom of God, and St. Paul teaches that this kingdom does not consist in meat and drink, but in righteousness. The prime work of the Church is

to bring men into right relations with God. It seeks first to save them from sin and fit them for the life to come. In this day, when men are so much concerned about health and home and material interests and try to use Church as well as State for their worldly advantage, we need to emphasize the spiritual aim of the Church.

But the Church has a mission of service to the poor. Our Lord not only preached the Gospel but also went about doing good. He healed the sick and in various ways ministered to the needy. No words have been more prolific in the ministry to the destitute than those of the sermon on the judgment: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto them ye have done it unto Me." The Church from the beginning has had its benevolent agencies. The first regularly elected officers were charged with the care of the widows. All down through its history it has had its infirmaries, its retreats for the aged and its homes for orphans. It has also fostered the spirit of private charity. It has provided for its own members and has gone out to assist and relieve those who had no special claim upon it. The Church set the example and created the conditions which made possible all outside benevolent institutions. The minister without relaxing his labors in the primary function of his office must not neglect this secondary duty of caring for the poor.

The highest and purest spirit of benevolence is Christian. There are natural affections. Brutes have paternal and social feelings. The mother will die for her young. Members of the same species gather in flocks and herds. Men have this same instinctive love. Scientific ethics regards it as the germ out of which all morals have been evolved. Love for family and tribe exists among the lowest savages. This tribal affection expands into a love for country. There are common ties and common instincts that bind men together into nations and generate a patriotism that has always been regarded a great virtue. The Greeks identified politics and ethics. Not even Plato and Aristotle were able to rise above the general idea. But rational ethics finds no sufficient basis for the love of universal humanity. Why should I care for the stranger in a foreign land? Why should I be interested in the people beyond the seas? Why should I forego a moment's pleasures for people whom I shall

never meet? These questions were almost always answered in the negative before Christ came. Only the later Stoics began to talk about a universal love for men, but it was not until after political misfortunes had destroyed the Greecian States and forced their philosophers to be cosmopolitan. Before the time of these later writers, Lucan, Seneca, Epictitus, and Marcus Aurilius, Christianity began to attract attention and their new idea may have been drawn from Christian virtues. At most it was a philosophic suggestion and would never have become effective. The love of universal man has a sufficient principle only in supreme love for God. God made all men and he is their Father. All are alike sinners. All have an immortal nature. A common origin, a common character and a common destiny bind them together in one common brotherhood. Christ is a propitiation for the sins of the world. "If God so loved us we ought to love one another." The Christian's love for his fellowmen springs out of love for God, and his love for God is inspired by the cross of Christ. This is the basis for genuine helpfulness. In its disinterestedness it stands in striking contrast with that of the world. Help in the lodge is based on the desire to get help. If there were no services returned there would be none rendered. Stand by me and I will stand by you is the sole principle. It is not to be absolutely condemned; it is a matter of business. But it is not the highest kind of service. It is not the principle of Christian ethics. Giving without expecting a return is the spirit taught us by our Lord and exemplified in His own life. Disinterested self-sacrifice for the good of the world, except as caught from Christianity, is found nowhere outside of the Church. If Christianity lowers its standard or loses its dominant influence over public sentiment we have reason to fear that the natural law of the survival of the fittest will assert itself in society and that the world will sink back into barbarism.

There is a strong pressure upon the Church to make benevolence its primary work. Ours is an age of co-operations in protection and combinations for protection and aid. Leagues and lodges flourish. Men look upon the Church as an organization of a similar character. They go to the lodge or the union rather than the Church because the Church does not provide nurses for them when they are sick, give them employment when they are

out of work and pay their funeral expenses when they are dead. The congregation is urged to turn itself into an association for mutual aid. Christ is regarded more as the Benefactor than as the Saviour. The institutional church meets in some degree this demand but in this fact lies its greatest danger. Material help is given that the beneficiaries may be brought under the influence of the Gospel. Material wants are supplied that hearts made tender by kindness may be open to the operation of the Holy Spirit. But pastors of such congregations, as Dr. A. C. Dixon of Boston, say that men come for the loaves and fishes but neglect the means of grace. How to conduct the benvolent work of the congregation in proper relation to the prime purpose of the Church is a problem that active pastors must solve. But whatever may be the solution there should be no surrender of the Christian principle of benevolence. The pastor must put such work upon the high plane St. Paul did: "Let this mind be in you which was in the Lord Jesus Christ who humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." If Christ crucified be so exalted in the pulpit that the people shall be filled with his spirit of love there will be no need of fairs and festivals and the various discreditable means often used to raise money to build churches, meet apportionment, support orphan children and carry forward educational and missionary work. If the true Christian spirit does not prompt it God cares nothing for the gift.

Preaching Christ crucified in the right way is always popular. Some months ago one of our prominent semi-religious papers sent out inquiries to a number of representative laymen about the kind of preaching the laity desired. A very large majority answered, "The simple Gospel." A minister makes a sad mistake when he turns his pulpit into a platform for the discussion of sociological, economic, scientific, political or literary themes. The people can study these things at their homes, and often they are as well acquainted with them as the pastor. If faithful to his work the minister can be only an amateur in other fields, but in religion he ought to be a master. The people go to church to hear about God and divine things. Only religious subjects should enter the sacred desk. Men do not care to hear in the sanctuary commonplaces on secular affairs. They want to be

helped into a closer fellowship with God. Our Lord was profoundly interested in the political troubles and the financial difficulties of that dark period into which his life had fallen. We are sure that He knew better than any other man of His age the solutions of the problems that confronted his country. He saw the wrongs of slavery and the oppression of the people by the public authorities. The great needs seemed to call for His help. But He kept himself strictly to His legitimate work. He preached the doctrines of the kingdom of God, fully assured that if men received the new life into their hearts all else desirable would follow. The preacher should not try to be wiser than his Master. There will be people whom he cannot reach, but let him remember that there were great numbers whom the Lord failed to draw. The pastor wants to save men and if Christ crucified does not attract and save nothing else can do it.

For the effective preaching of Christ crucified two things are of supreme importance to the preacher. The first is a direct personal knowledge of the truth he preaches. He must know Christ as He is set forth in the Gospels. His library may have all the numerous lives which have poured from the press since Straus' Leben Jesu was published, but he finds nowhere such a vivid portraiture of that marvelous character as is given by the four evangelists. Here he gets his facts and impressions from original sources and in studying them he is living amid the scenes under which that life was spent. Here he comes into closest touch with his Lord. The preacher must know not only the history of Christ but also the doctrines concerning His person. He must be a good theologian to be a good preacher. Like the Scribe instructed into the kingdom of heaven, he must be able to bring out things new and old from a treasury constantly enriched by indefatigable study. Shallow theologians are always superficial preachers who need frequent change of pastorates and are usually out of demand as soon as they have passed the noon-tide of middle life. Students in the seminary who cram their dogmatics for examination cripple themselves for life, and pastors who leave their systems of theology to be shelfworn and dust-covered are permitting their strength to leak And the preacher must have a personal slowly from them. knowledge of the saving power of the Gospel. Luther's force as a preacher and reformer came out of his own personal experience. Spurgeon and Moody were not intellectually great men but they were among the greatest preachers in the generation just passed because their sermons were saturated with their own fervent piety. Their eloquence was born not in the schools of oratorical culture, but in their intense earnestness. The effective preacher knows the deadly power of sin, the blessedness of forgiveness and the fulness of a life in fellowship with Christ. His sermons are always fresh. He necessarily preaches often commonplaces but the spiritual life gushing out through these familiar truths gives all the charm of novelty. There was nothing particularly new or striking in Spurgeon's or Moody's sermons except the aptness of their illustrations, but thousands were eager to hear them. A heart afire with the love of a crucified Saviour will always be eloquent and can not fail to kindle a flame in the hearts of others. No one should undertake to lead men to the cross unless he himself lives under it.

The other matter of great importance to a preacher is to be in touch with the age in which he lives. Does Christianity change? A categorical answer can not be given. Christianity as a sum of beliefs held by the Church in any given age changes. No one believes now the opinions that were universal in the Church down to the time of Copernicus in regard to the sun and stars. Creeds change. But Christianity as a system of truths taught by Christ and His apostles can not change. Truth is immutable. What is once true is true forever. Creeds as statements of truth may change their forms of expression but not their substance without ceasing to be true creeds. Creeds are antithetical. They find their reason for existence in some current error and when that is finally overthrown the creed is no longer useful except as a convenient means of instruction. In adjusting himself to the age the preacher must not surrender a single truth that is taught in the Bible. Methods only must be adopted to conditions. Our Lord did not disclose the whole truth because those among whom he lived could not bear it. It was left to the apostles to unfold what much of His teaching involved. St. Paul used one style of reasoning when he preached to the Jews and another to the Gentiles, but everywhere his theme was Christ crucified. Arguments sound in themselves have less force in one age or in one community than in another. The chapter on prophecy has been left out of all recent books on evidences. Miracles are said to be a hindrance now to faith. The story of creation is called a legend. When such ideas prevail the fact must be recognized even though they be not accepted. It is useless to employ a means of proof that will not convince.

There has been a tremendous upheval in thought in recent years. Science arrogates to itself the whole field of truth. Church as it has come down to us from the past is said to be doomed. Even some weak-kneed Christians are very much concerned about the future of Christianity. It must be encouraging to them to find a man like Dr. Paulsen giving reasons why religion cannot die, and some like Renan asserting that philosophy can never be a religion. "Its simplicity will always hinder Deism from becoming a religion. A religion as clear as geometry would excite neither love nor hatred. The more evident a truth is the less we care for it. The dogmas of the Catholics repel us; their old churches enchant us. The Protestant confessions do not satisfy us, while the austere poetry of their worship fills us with rapture. An ancient Judaism does not please us, but its psalms will remain a source of consolation." Science and philosophy can never take the place of religion. Christianity will never be supplanted. Men in every age are sinners. No science or philosophy will ever be able to destroy their conviction of the freedom of the will and eradicate the consciousness of guilt. They want reconciliation with their better self and the great Power behind the universe. Atheism can never become general. Pantheism will always be confined to speculative schools. Men in trouble will never cease to pray. They will continue to look forward to another life in spite of materialism. These are universal facts. They have been true from the remotest part and will remain true in the most distant future. The preacher in appealing to them can always expect a response. This was the power in the time of the apostles that triumphed over the scepticism and sensualism of their age. It is a power that can never fail to be effective. Christ crucified is the only satisfactory answer to the deepest longings of an awakened heart. He is God coming in supreme love to save and bless His wayward children. Here is the assurance of fellowship with God and the pledge of immortality. Christ crucified is the Gospel for an age of doubt as well as for every other age. The preacher needs to understand his age only that he may have the nearest approach to the spiritual life of its people.

Salem, Va.

#### ARTICLE V.

### GOD'S FELLOW-WORKERS IN THE MINISTRY.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID B. FLOYD, D.D.

When Paul wrote: "He gave some to be apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints into the work of ministering," (Eph. 4:11), he enumerated a series of gifts bestowed upon God's fellow-workers in the early Church. They were Christ's gifts to the Church for a special work. The importance of these various gifts Paul emphasized by duplicating a similar enumeration in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (12:28). I enter not into the controversy respecting names and orders of the Holy Ministry, which have agitated the Church more or less for centuries. Suffice it to say, that the word "Apostles," refers to the well known Twelve, whom the Saviour selected to accompany Him in His labors, and possibly to others including Paul and Barnabas (Acts 14:14). Their office, which ceased with their lives, was peculiar, extraordinary and miraculous. "Prophets" belonged to a class of teachers endowed with the gifts of prophecy, whose chief function was edification. Such persons were Agabus, Judas and Silas, and possibly Philip's four daughters, who were prophetesses. Their gifts were bestowed to meet the emergency of the dawn of the Christian era. "Evangelists" were traveling missionaries, who preached the Gospel from city to city and seemed to have had no individual pastoral charge. They acted in subordination to the apostles. Philip is named as one of them and possibly Timothy (2 Tim. 4:5). The term is not synonymous with modern professional evangelists. "Pastors and Teachers" were those whom the apostles ordained over individual Churches to inculcate the truths of Christianity, to superintend the government of the Church, and to administer the sacraments. The names of Bishops, Elders and Deacons are not given in this list. These terms, however, are distinctly mentioned elsewhere (Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 2:25; 1 Cor. 3:5; 2 Cor. 6:4).

Men regularly licensed and ordained by Synods and Conferences of the various churches are filling the office of "pastors and teachers." Their duty is briefly comprehended in the charge, which Paul gave to the Ephesian Elders, when he said: "Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops." (Acts 20:28).

# THE WORKERS. Οἱ Εργάται,

At one time the Lord Jesus Christ was the only worker in the ministry. "As yet only one expert, but He is training others, and He has faith in prayer for better men and times." (A. B. Bruce). When the number of laborers was not many, He said: "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few." (Οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι). (Matt. 9:37). The hardest labor of ancient times was performed in harvest fields. Under the figure of such fields and their laborers, "the Lord of the harvest" illustrated His Church and ministers. The field is the world and the ministers are reapers of the ripe and perishing and human grain. The prophet commanded: "Put ve in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe." (Joel 3:13). No moral mowing machines have ever been invented that can replace the old-time sickles of pulpits. Paul exhorts Timothy to be "a workman (ἐργάτην) that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth." (2 Tim. 2:15).

If God had designed the ministry for a sine-cure, those having entered the ministerial office would be inappropriately called "workers." Young men, who are thinking of entering the ministry for a life of ease, should either abandon the thought or the ministry. When its responsibilities are fully realized and its duties honestly discharged, the work cannot be easy. The labor is harder to-day than it was a generation ago, when the spirit of adverse criticism was not so general. By weakened and tainted faith through a baneful influence of ultra Biblical criticism, whereby doubt and uncertainty have entered halls of theology and stood in front of altars of churches, a demand for the integrity of the Holy Scriptures by a pure and faithful ministry is greater than it ever has been.

Those who may think that ministers need only to appear in pulpits to pound sermons out of the Bible or shake them out of their sleeves, have only a ludicrous conception of the cost of sermonic production. Sir Joshua Reynolds was requested by a nobleman to paint his portrait. In a few days a bill for 500 guineas was presented with the finished picture. The man objected to the price, because it cost the labor, as he thought, of a few days only. But the artist said it had taken him forty years to paint it. The author of a book, as he presented his friend with a copy, said: "You will read it in a few hours, but the labor expended in writing it, has whitened my hair." The late Dr. John Watson (Ian Maclaren) was asked how long it required for the preparation of a sermon. The witty Scotch preacher replied: "If you mean to write the manuscript, then a day may suffice; but if you mean to think a sermon, then it may be ten years." A sermon is the result of years of mental toil. Days of laborious thought lie back of the time occupied in its delivery. The gathered results of a sermon often represent the study of years.

When men are disposed to yield to the temptation of indolence, those "of the cloth" have unusual opportunities for its indulgence. In his address to candidates for the ministry in the Methodist Church, the late Bishop Fowler, a few years ago, said: "Your greatest enemy will be laziness. The Methodist ministry offers a magnificent opportunity for laziness." Methodist ministers have no "Rights Reserved" for the sale of this indulgence. Preachers in other churches are affected with this affliction. It is one of the causes of unemployed ministers and one of the causes of frequent changes of pastorates among the employed ministers. The Church suffers from ecclesiastical loafers. The talent of the wicked and slothful servant was taken away from him. (Matt. 25:28).

Workers in the ministry should not confine their labors exclusively to miscellaneous reading of commentaries and encyclopedias. Their researches should widen into lines of direct bearing on their work. They should not imagine that intellectual preaching will drive away the people. Many persons to whom Paul preached the Gospel and wrote epistles were slaves and servants. He did not comfort them with simple stories and com-

mon-place remarks; but with the profound logic of the Epistle to the Romans, and with the involutions of sentences and profundity of mysticism of the Epistle to the Ephesians.

Associated with their labors, ministers should maintain a working knowledge of the original languages of the Scriptures, which were providentially chosen to convey the will of God to man. In view of the modern critical studies of the Bible and of recent archaeological researches in Oriental lands, there is a revival in the study of the sacred languages. Biblical literature is enriched with criticisms based on the Hebrew and Greek texts. The best English and German commentaries cannot be used to their highest advantage without a working knowledge of these languages. Luther made a daily study of them and said that he would not exchange his knowledge of Hebrew for mines of gold. Herein lies the key to his marvellous translation of the Bible, and his almost inspired interpretation of its difficult passages. "If a man wishes to ascertain for himself what the real drift and scope of the declarations of the sacred writers of the Old Testament is, then he will find that a thorough knowledge of the elements of the sacred languages is almost everything. It has been from a want of this knowledge that commentators. preachers and others have so frequently and fatally erred; and generally speaking, that, at this day, the Scriptures of the Old Testament are so little understood." (Prof. Lee in his lectures on Hebrew to the students of Cambridge University). A contributor to the Edinburgh Review says: "A knowledge of the New Testament Greek, notwithstanding the assaults made upon it, is, fortunately, still absolutely necessary for the clergy; but in the present state of theological controversy, a thorough knowledge of Hebrew is even more necessary. On almost every disputed point of Biblical criticism, the man, who is not a Hebrew scholar, is entirely at the mercy of the man who is."

The labors of faithful ministers can never be written. Their biographers may recount the churches which they erected, the works of charity which they inaugurated and fostered, the sermons they preached, the children they baptized, and the persons they confirmed. But all these only touch the surface of their laborious lives. There is no record given of their daily lives of use-

fulness. These are "hid with Christ in God," and are registered only by His recording angel.

## THE FELLOW-WORKERS. Οἱ Συνεργοί.

This is a Pauline word occuring repeatedly in Paul's Epistles in connection with the names of Aquila, Aristarchus, Luke, Mark, Philemon, Prisca, Timothy, Titus and Urbanus, who were his companions in Christian labor. It is once employed by John in the third Epistle. As used by Paul (generally in the singular number), the word means co-operation of ministers in the work of salvation. It refers to those who labor with others in extending the Gospel. It has reference to companionship in work.

Divine operation awaits human co-operation. The kingdom of Christ will not flourish, while ministers, to whom its concerns are entrusted, are at variance. Spiritual buildings cannot arise in goodly proportions and become dwelling places for God, if the workmen labor not together. Throughout the Scriptures, the Church is figuratively represented as a luminous sun and ministers are bearers of its light; as a vast field in which they are sowers of seed; as a fruitful vineyard, in which they are laborers; as a palatial dwelling in which they are servants; and as a sure foundation on which they are masterbuilders. In a work like this, how should ministers strive together in prayers to God, and in fellowship with each other in its prosecution!

Fellowship is enforced by Paul's example and authority. In the truest sense, Paul to the Jews became a Jew, and to the Greeks a Greek. He sought earnestly to harmonize differences. With peculiar solemnity he enjoined unity among the divided Corinthians: Now, I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you." (1 Cor. 1:10). With equal zeal he addressed the Ephesians: "I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." (4:1, 2). With feelings of tenderness, he inculcates this sentiment upon the Philippians:

"If there is, therefore, any comfort in Christ, if any consolation of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any tender mercies and compassions, fulfil ye my joy, that ye be of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind." (2:1, 2). If these inspired precepts were intended to bind together the laymen of the church, what should they do for the fellow-workers in the ministry? If God has included ministers as partners in His work, they must not array themselves against themselves. One class of workers must not unchurch all others by giving special prominence to its own shibboleth; by declaring that there are no ministers except those who trace their "Holy Orders" to the apostles. Ecclesiastical parties must not gather up their clerical robes at the approach of others. The objects of their labors are the same, though their methods may differ.

Paul's inspiration widened into boundless affection for his fellow-workers. He has left us such lists of salutations at the close of his Epistles in which names of both men and women are mentioned, and to which their characters and services are referred, with such delicate and just discriminations, that they become models and examples. Observe the variety of his salutations in his Epistle to the Romans: "Salute Prisca and Aquila my fellow-workers in Christ Jesus, who for my life laid down their own necks. Salute Andronicus and Junias, my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who also have been in Christ before me. Salute Urbanus, our fellow-worker in Christ. Timothy, my fellow-worker, saluteth

you. Salute one another with a holy kiss."

Fellowship is sustained by the practice of the Church. In the history of primitive Christianity, unity was exemplified among members and fellowship among ministers. The common doctrine as set forth in the Apostles' Creed exhibits the bond of unity, which prevailed in the first centuries of the Church. Eusebius, the father of Ecclesiastical history, who related the principal events in the Christian Church to the year A. D. 324, gave no account of any real dissensions (argumentum e silentio). When the Arian heresy arose in the 4th century, the Church reaffirmed her unity of faith in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. In the 16th century, Luther and the Reformers confessed their faith in the perpetuation of One Holy Apostolic

Church. In the 17th century, unity of doctrine between Lutherans and Reformers was recognized in the syncretistic movement headed by George Calixtus. In 1850, ministers numbering 2500, representing four great denominations of Europe, declared at Berlin, that the Augsburg Confession contained the system of evangelical Christianity. And in 1908 as many as 400 ministers of churches of Christ in America, embracing 33 different denominations, met in Federal Council at Philadelphia with the view of general co-operation in church work.

Co-operating harmoniously, it cannot be expected that Christian workers must agree in all things. At Antioch Paul withstood Peter to the face (Gal. 2:11), and had a sharp contention with Barnabas. (Acts 15:39). When differences were fundamental and principle involved, Paul exclaimed: "But though we or an angel from heaven should preach unto you any Gospel other than that which we preach unto you, let him be anathama." (Gal. 1:8). In the apostolic period fellow-workers preached the same doctrines. The teachings of the Christ were not differently interpreted by Paul and the Twelve, as asserted by the Tübingen School of Criticism founded on the Hegelian theory of development.

The separation of the Christian Church into denominations, (not sects), worked out by great systems of theology, shows divine wisdom. But neither divine nor human wisdom is exhibited, when a denomination itself separates into factions. Zealous promoters of church schisms are guilty of great wrongs. Whatever may be said of the American Lutheran Church, a general spirit of Lutheran Catholicity prevails. Closer forms of union between our ministers and synods are indicated. Intersynodically we agree on a greater number of points than on the number of those on which we differ. Differences which divide us into separate bodies arc few, while our points of contact are many. In our Christo-Centric system, we exalt the One Great Name of Christ. We subscribe to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession. The pure doctrine of the sacraments is taught in all our seminaries. For a quarter of a century the Church has shown a decided unanimity in interpretation and acceptance of the letter and spirit of Lutheran symbols. In recent years fraternal delegates of synods have been exchanged. A "Common

Service" for all Lutherans has been adopted. Free joint conferences have been held. These all are important factors in the promotion of a better understanding and closer relation among Lutheran fellow-workers.

## III. GOD'S FELLOW-WORKERS.

#### Θεοῦ συνεργοί.

Pertaining to the subject under consideration, the passage in 1 Thess. 3:2 contains a suspected reading by reason of variations of MSS. Some high authorities like Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort following the Codex Sinaiticus read: Siakovov τοῦ θεοῦ (God's minister). Others like Griesbach and Lachmann following several less ancient MSS. read: συνεργόν τοῦ θεοῦ (God's fellow-worker). The New Testament makes a distinction between the work of the Suararos and the συνεργός, latest Greek texts eliminate "fellow-worker" from the verse and insert it in the margin. The passage in 1 Cor. 3:9, the genuineness and authenticity of which, however, have not been questioned, boldly and clearly sets forth the phrase: θεοῦ συνεργοί (God's fellow-workers). God is the emphatic word of the verse. The emphasis is conveyed in the Divine Name thrice put foremost! Mark the arrangement: θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί. γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε.

"For of God are we fellow-workers: Of God husbandry, of God building are ye." Here are three genitives of possession. God's fellow-workers employed in God's field and on God's building. By use of the first and second persons of the one verb and its positions in the verse, Paul sharply draws a distinction between preachers and laymen. The phrases—"God's husbandry" and "God's building" indicate the kind of labor in which God's fellow-workers are engaged. The one points to the cultivation of a field (verse 6) and the other to the erection of a house (verse 10). The one relates chiefly to internal growth and the other to external. Lightfoot says: "Of the two images, "husbandry" implies organic growth of the Church; "building" the mutual adaptation of its parts."

In the translation of this verse, the Revised Version differs from that of the Authorized Version. The R. V. reads: "For we are God's fellow-workers," i. e. We are fellow-workers in God's employment; under His direction and supervision. Thepassage does not illustrate workers with God so much as workers of God. It is a combination of two ideas, viz:-laborers working with one another in the service of God. The A. V. reads: "For we are laborers together with God." This rendering implies a joint-work of God and His laborers without special reference to co-operation of the laborers themselves. If this be the meaning of the passage, (many interpreters so understand it), then the words add a peculiar sanctity and exalted dignity to the ministerial office. No higher honor could be bestowed upon men than to be employed in the same work in which God is engaged; than to be joint-workers with God in the salvation of souls. The common name of prophet was "Man of God." A prophet was not his own, but God's man. Paul elsewhere expresses this dignified relation, when he calls himself, as he loved to do, "the slave of Jesus Christ." Honest wage-work is dignified. Thomas Carlysle said: "In all true work, were it but hand labor, thereis something of divineness." Then what must be the dignity of laborers associated with God Himself in a work! What must be the exaltation of the labor, the chief object of which is salvation of souls!

The clause not only expresses the idea of fellow-workers, but also God's fellow-workers laboring with Him, yet not in the same rank as co-ordinates, but as agents in subordination. God operates through men, whom he employs as His servants. Ministers are laborers in the divine handiwork. Salvation is the result of God's work and man's. It's God's work operating through man.

Above all others, Christ was God's fellow-worker. He said: "My Father worketh even until now and I work." (Jno. 5:17). On Him the measureless spirit of God was poured. Through Him the work of God was accomplished. And by Him eternal life is given to all, whom God has chosen. Jesus said of Himself: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto; but to minister." (Matt. 20-28). He demonstrated this principle, when arrayed in garments of a servant, He washed the feet of His disciples. Hence ministers are laboring in a kingdom, which from all eternity has employed the deep thoughts of God. Their

work belongs to earth, but their thoughts belong to heaven. God takes them into fellowship of labor with Himself. He shares with them His authority, His power, His honor, His joy in the work. They are so related to Him, that when they speak, their words are His words. "For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father, that speaketh in you." (Matt. 10:20).

There are ministers, however, who are not thus related; who have felt no divine impulse constraining them to preach the Gospel; who have only drifted into the ministry; whose sermons are only drift-wood; whose sincerity is expended on religionism and not on religion; who are speaking for God, yet are not in touch with God; who allow sensual gratifications and desires to betray them into unhallowed ways. Doubtless there are men preaching to others, who are themselves rejected. (1 Cor. 9:27).

Paul draws a distinction between the preacher and the character of his preaching. "But if any man buildeth on the foundation, gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay stubble; each man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work shall abide, which he buildeth thereon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss." (1 Cor. 3:12-15). Ministers who search the newspapers for topics of sermons and preach eloquently on the slime and crime of the week, may attract a crowd, entertain hearers, and create a sensation; but they hold no grip on conscience, preach no Gospel and accomplish no good. The work of some sincere and energetic, but mistaken preachers is worthless and will "be burned." A serious and sad condition of our church life at the present time is the spread of sensationalism in pulpits—the morbid craving of preachers for crowds and throngs. All kinds of novelties to attract a crowd are applied. Not long ago, while a preacher was delivering a temperance sermon in his church, a drunken man staggered in (possibly by pre-arrangement), and the minister helped the man into the pulpit, and exhibited him to the audience as a maudlin object lesson. In another church the preacher showed skilful slight-of-hand performances. He entertained his audience by exploding torpedoes at the ends of his fingers as he gesticulated, and by deftly unfolding his handkerchief, the country's flag appeared, by which he illustrated how the Church made Americans out of foreigners. Ian Maclaren would call such preachers: "Verbal jugglers performing in sacred places." This travesty of preaching may draw people and make them laugh; but it will repel angels and make them

weep.

In one of our leading city papers much space was consumed in Monday's issue by what the flaming headlines named: "The Brightest Thoughts Uttered by Our City Pulpit Orators." Making a casual and cursory examination of these "Brightest Thoughts," I possibly discovered a reason why some men may attend church services for a decade of years and yet ask the way of salvation. One of the "orators" talked on "Corporations;" another spoke on what he called "A Lesson From Spain;" another praised "The Manliness of Athletics;" and another announced for his subject: "Farewell Cleveland: Hail Taft!" (Mr. Cleveland had recently died and Mr. Taft was nominated for President). In all these "Brightest Thoughts" no allusion to Christ was made. The only preaching that will convince skeptics and convert sinners is that which lifts up the crucified Son of God. The preaching that opens blind eyes, and melts hard hearts, and sweetens daily lives and softens dying beds is Christ preaching. This kind of preaching explains the power of the most effective proclaimers of the Gospel from Paul to Luther and from Luther to the present day. Paul's most solemn injunction to Timothy was: "Preach the Word."

Selins Grove, Pa.

19097

## ARTICLE VI.



#### RECENT GERMAN RESEARCH CONCERNING LUTHER.

BY ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, M.A., B.D.

Several factors combine to arouse at present an unusual interest in the investigation of the life and thought of Luther. the first place this heightened interest is incidental to the modern energetic prosecution of historical research along all lines, and the determined effort to penetrate the hidden or obscure past and to understand even in the details all ages and all departments of human activity. Then, too, at a time like the present when such abnormal stress is being laid upon the cultivation of personality. it is to be expected that renewed interest should attach to the unique and significant personality of the Reformer. This latter can, however, only be considered a purely incidental factor, for in general the personality culturist has no direct interest in the past; its great principles have for him "only an historical value." But indirectly this trend in modern thinking would help to arrive at the correct story of Luther's inner development. Moreover, patriotic motives are not lacking. An eminent German jurist once said, "The German people has thrice loved: Charlemagne, Luther, Bismarck." Certain it is that the loyal German sees now more clearly than ever before the tremendous significance of Luther and Bismarck for his Fatherland. The former saved the Germans and delivered them from Rome; the latter saved Germany and made it a world power. Statues of both are numerons in this country; time and again their names are ranged side by side, and both of them are given prominent places on the scroll of the nation's great. And this appreciation of Luther from a popular and national stand-point has deepened not a little just since the establishing of the empire and the awakening of the national consciousness.

But a far more important stimulus to detailed and accurate investigation of Luther's life and work is found in the repeated vicious attacks which have been aimed at his character and his reformation. They issue from the Catholic camp. One of them

was discussed at some length in these columns. Others have followed. In these late efforts of the Catholics there is a very distinct abandonment of the method of previous days, which consisted in hurling upon their object relentless tirades of abusive epithets. The qualities that are now applied are indeed by no means flattering to the hero of the sixteenth century, but this time proofs are offered, a show of great learning is made, a pretense of correct method is affected and a degree of plausibility is wrought into the presentations. And in fact some of the publications gave evidence of a minute examination of the sources. The Protestant historians were forced to take up the defense and the mass of Luther literature has been increased in a comparatively short time by quite a number of volumes. The result has exposed the utter bias and unscientific motives of the Romish historians, and has revealed the wildest contortion of facts, the crudest interpretation of sources and a complete lack of historical method on the part of the Catholic polemics. What professed to be history was only ultramontane polemics. But the result of the contest has not been entirely negative. We have received a clearer and more exact picture of the man Luther, especially from a psychological point of view, and this is of no small importance in estimating his theological significance. Additions have been made to the sources. Some weaknesses in previous views on Luther have been brought to light and corrected. And a tremendous impetus has been given to research along the whole line of the German Reformation.

Another volley of missiles aimed at Luther's person and work has come from a camp which in Germany's political life today is closely allied with the Catholic camp. This is the party of ultra-radical politics, and especially of the socialistic democracy. Because Luther did not forthwith adopt the radical policies and fanaticism of Thomas Münzer and his heavenly prophets, and because he did not unreservedly support the peasants in their uprisings in 1524-25, he is now heaped with such titles as enemy of the people, blood-thirsty worshiper of princes, venal drudge, social parasite, industrial leach, and so forth. But the attacks from this quarter are less elaborate, the motives more evident, and the manner of presentation less subtle, and so they have not

attracted nearly so much attention as those from the ultramontane quarter.

But there is still another factor which for the immediate present and the near future is perhaps more potent in directing attention to Luther than any of the elements we have already mentioned. This has to do entirely with his theology. The stimulus comes this time from the ranks of the Protestant theologians themselves. Whereas the theologians of the Hegelian left were not long since vastly over-estimating Luther's significance in making him the founder of a new religion better than the religion of Jesus himself, today we are obliged to face just the opposite extreme, a serious under-estimating of Luther in making him merely an extraordinary, gifted mediaeval monk, separated from the organized Roman Catholic Church. This view issues chiefly from the representatives of the very newest theological method, the method of comparative religions (die religionsgeschichtliche methode). In rejecting the absolute character and divine origin of Christianity and in regarding the Christian religion in its origin and unfolding in doctrine and life through striking personalities as merely one phase in the development of the religious human race, this theological tendency which aims at being a distinct method, puts a very different interpretation upon Luther's theology, and assigns him a very different historical significance from the traditional one. And, of course, when it is asserted and argued out and made a part of a fine ingenious system, that Luther belonged to the Middle Ages, that he presented nothing new in importance, that he rather delayed the dawn of the modern era for 200 years by making the darkness of the Middle Ages more tolerable, it is to be expected that there would be a rush to the defense on the part of those who have learned to look upon Luther as the restorer of the pure gospel and the liberator of modern thought.

These are the chief factors and motives which have made for the active prosecution of the work in most recent times. But the ground upon which they build has long since been broken. When Ranke delivered history-writing from dogmatism and raised it to the level of an independent science, he made a big breach in the wall of traditional Luther-literature, and his German History of the Age of the Reformation, which appeared in 1839 marked an epoch in this department. But the work progressed slowly until about a generation ago. In 1880 the Vatican archives were made accessible to Protestant scholars. About the same time a number of valuable discoveries were made in several libraries in Germany. Then in 1883 came the elaborate celebration of the fourth centennial of Luther's birth, arousing a wide-spread interest in the life and work of the Reformer. This interest naturally manifested itself in a literary way. And so far from abating it has deepened into the very details and expanded to include the testimony of the most distantly related contemporaries, and under the stimulating influences mentioned above it has increased even to the present. The source materials have received many most valuable additions. At the same time the field of observation has become very much wider and the problems correspondingly complicated. Inestimable are the powers that are being applied to the work, and scarcely a week goes by without bringing some new addition to the literature. though not all additions are of equal significance. A complete library of Luther literature would contain something over 2000 separate volumes, to say nothing of the almost innumerable essays, treatises, and smaller articles in scientific and literary quarterlies, monthlies, etc. And this library would include all forms of literary composition, biographies, novels, epic and lyric poems, dramas, etc., and the language of all civilized nations would be represented, though of course Luther's own mothertongue would be far in the lead.

Before reviewing the chief results of the recent research we may call attention briefly to a very few of the most important recent publications. Julius Köstlin, who a generation ago, was the recognized leader among authorities on Luther, was called home in 1902 at the ripe age of 76. But his classic "Martin Luther, sein Leben und seine Schriften," of which the second edition had appeared in the centennial year 1883, has been thoroughly revised and brought up to date by Kawerau in the fifth edition, 1903, so as to embody the results of research up to that time, and thus for thoroughness, accuracy, and uniformity of detail, Köstlin remains first and last among modern biographies of Luther. Though properly a dogmatician Köstlin has made invaluable contributions to the Luther investigation, both di-

rectly and through the enlistment of other scholars, and in his work as associate editor of the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, that quarterly which has done so much to further our scientific knowledge of Luther, as president of the Union for Reformation History, and in a host of learned articles on various phases of Luther's life and work, he may be considered the pioneer in the movement which has led to the present high standard of critical research in this department.

Among other worthy biographies must be mentioned that of Theodor Kolde (first volume 1883, second 1889) which, although it does not aim at the completeness of detail that we find in Köstlin, and lays stress only upon certain periods, important in the unfolding of Luther's work, is nevertheless written with a much better knowledge of the whole reformation movement and of contemporaneous political events. Kolde's "Analecta Lutherana," appearing in the centennial year, served as a valuable complement to the literature on Luther's correspondence. In recent years the services of this Erlangen historian have been chiefly valuable in bringing the witness of many hitherto rather obscure contemporaries of Luther. In the last few years he has devoted his attention to the history of the confessions, more especially of the Augustana, and he does not regard it as impossible or even improbable that a copy of the original of the Augustana will some day be found.

The latest note-worthy biography of Luther is the brilliant two-volumed work from the pen of Adolph Hausrath. It appeared in 1904. As Köstlin-Kawerau portrayed the man, his life and work in all directions, and as Kolde pictured with good perspective the man coming out from the crowd and performing a mission in the presence of his people, so Hausrath paints Luther the wonderful personality pre-eminent among his fellows. The style is exemplary and the presentation is pleasing. The many sides of the Reformer's unique personality are splendidly portrayed so as to form a well-rounded aesthetic whole. But the work is not in all parts accurate, as it does not take into account all the results of recent research. And Luther's religious achievements do not receive a proper appreciation. Especially amiss is the construction which regards the experiences in the cloister as the outgrowth of physical disturbances and semi-historical mel-

ancholy spiced with sentimentality. And in general Luther's religious life is represented as beautiful and effeminate rather than weighty and crushing, a consuming fire of glowing coals.

Other recent biographies are those of Rade (3 volumes, 1901, popular), Lenz (3rd edition 1897, for the school), Fauth (1897, narration for the people), and Buchwald (1902). Buchwald's' biography is specially adapted to the home. It is profusely illustrated, popular in style, interesting in presentation, and written with a full and accurate knowledge of the subject. A good translation into English would undoubtedly be favorably received. Buchwald, who is now a pastor in Leipzig, has made contributions of immense value to the sources on Luther. New manu. scripts, one after another at Zwickau first and then at Jena, he has discovered and published. The results of his investigations have been presented chiefly in the new edition of Luther's works. but also in independent publications. Most valuable for the questions of the present day may be regarded his discovery of a number of books from Luther's library before 1517, containing significant marginal notes from Luther's own hand.

With reference to Luther's works themselves a decided step forward has been made in the Weimar edition begun in that same year, 1883. This great task was undertaken with the aid of a ministerial commission and funds from the Emperor, but for some time it progressed rather slowly, only seven volumes appearing in fifteen years. But since 1897 new vigor has been infused into the work, and in May, 1908, the 34th volume (Part I), was delivered to the public. It has engaged from time to time the labors of a long list of scholars, presents a vast amount of new material embodying many of the recent finds and the results of textual criticism, though the most valuable results of critical research in the source materials is to be expected in the closing volumes of the work where Luther's correspondence and table-talk are to appear.

For remarkable results have been achieved along these lines. The Enders edition of Luther's correspondence is a very decided improvement on de Wette. In 1906 death called away the aged pastor, Enders, as he stood in the middle of his eleventh volume, but Kawerau has assured the writer that he expects to carry out the remainder of the work, which will cover the last eight years

of Luther's life. Not only has the number of letters been increased, but indispensable revisions have been made. And yet, since Enders began his work so many discoveries have been made in this direction by Burkhardt, Kolde, and others, that the Weimar edition, if completed today, would still have considerably more than one hundred new letters to publish. And since Seidemann's first efforts to recover the originals of Luther's tabletalk a host of manuscripts in Leipsic, Nuremberg, Munich, Berlin, Breslau, Dorpat and elsewhere has been brought to light by Kroker, Lösche, Preger, Wrempelmeyer, Meyer, and others, so that it will be possible to publish the notes of hearers of the tabletalk in practically their original form.

Other notable additions to the source materials are the copies of lectures previous to 1517 throwing a flood of light on Luther's theological development. Especially valuable are those on the Psalms, Galatians, Hebrews, and, above all, Romans. Contributions to this material have been made by Buchwald. Johannes, Ficker, Pietsch, Nikolaus Müller, Denifle, and others. over, a new side of Luther's academic life has been made known to us through the discoveries relating to the disputations which he instituted in Wittenberg. In 1895 Drews brought us chiefly from Munich and Wolfenbüttel the manuscript copies of twentyfive such disputations covering the years from 1535 to 1545. An abundance of material relating to the catechisms has also been found by Buchwald, Knoke, and most recently by Albrecht. Such are the series of sermons preached in 1528 presenting the material afterwards embodied in the Larger Catechism, and the evidence that the Smaller Catechism was first published not as a book, but as tables, one after another.

With all these improved facilities for getting information we may hope for corresponding results in our knowledge of Luther's life and corresponding changes in our total conception of his character and work. A number of such results have already appeared. No doubt many are yet to be wrought out. Concerning many of the details and individual facts of that remarkable life we now have more accurate information than our fathers had. Then, too, we are in a position to trace more clearly his development from a dissatisfied monk to a reformer within the Church and then to the Reformer from the Church. Our pic-

ture of his personality, somewhat like our picture of his physiognomy, has undergone a great change, set as it is in the light of his own times. We have become much better acquainted with the background of his thought-life. And we are in a position to view his achievements in the perspective of the centuries preceding and following him, and to estimate in the light of our advanced age the enormous significance of his work, not only for religion and theology, but also for ethics and morals, for industry and society, for literature, language, for art and science, for

law and government.

The time of Luther's birth and the manner of his death have become more definitely fixed. The book of the late pastor, Oergel in Erfurt, "Vom jungen Luther" (1899), in which he argued for 1482 as the year of Luther's birth, called forth several articles on the subject (Köhler, Drews, Kawerau). The strongest arguments are decidedly in favor of the traditional date 1483; the day, November 10th, cannot be seriously questioned. The persistent fiction of Luther's suicide which occurs from time to time among Catholic historians and has been revived most recently by Majunke, has now been traced to its source among the Catholics of the sixteenth century, and has been conclusively refuted, while on the other hand his natural death with exact circumstances has been proved. That Luther is buried in Wittenberg and not at some unknown spot in that neighborhood was placed beyond doubt upon the renovating of the Schlosskirche in 1897, the evidence being arrayed by Köstlin in practically his last independent publication.

Luther's journey to Rome has received much attention in the last ten years. The impressions he received on that occasion must certainly be important for the progress of his inner development. But when, how, and why did he make the journey? The discussion has given rise to three separate works on the subject, besides a series of able articles, and has engaged such men as Hausrath, Drews, Kawerau, Nik. Paulus, and others. That he was sent to Rome on business of his Augustinian order is practically certain, but whether as the representative of Staupitz or of the opposition to Staupitz, is not so easy to decide, though the best opinion now inclines to the latter view. Closely related is the question concerning the date of the journey. Was it 1510 or 1511? Recent opinion, based upon the newly discovered fact that Luther was once in Cologne, would seem to place the Rometrip in the Winter of 1511-1512.

The cause and controversy about indulgences which played such an important part in the beginnings of the Reformation have been set in fuller light. Aloys Schulte, a Catholic, in his able history of that great banking-firm (Die Fugger in Rom. 1495-1523, appeared 1904) has drawn aside the curtain and given us a clear view of the awful simony which was carried on between the pope and archbishop Albert of Mayence, because the latter desired to retain Magdeburg and Halberstadt in his archbishopalric. Another Catholic scholar, Nikolaus Paulus, in his large biography of Tetzel, though by no means unbiased, has presented much that is instructive for the history of indulgencepreaching in Luther's time. But the historians have not been satisfied with the external history of the indulgences. They have sought to go back of the events which transpired, to analyze the nature and essence of indulgences, and to understand just exactly what it was that fanned to a flame the smouldering fire within Luther's breast, and brought forth the ninety-five theses. And here Walther Köhler has shown special merit in his Documents relating to the Indulgence-Controversy (1902) presenting a highly instructive array of papal decrees and theological discussions bearing on absolution and indulgences in the entire period from the eleventh century to Luther's time. He has also made the application to Luther's theses (1903), and to the discussion they called forth. Luther was not fighting a phantom. Paulus, too, has brought a number of articles on the subject in which, however, he takes pains to show that the attritio of the indulgences is really equivalent to contritio. Specially noteworthy also in making clear the essence of the indulgences as understood in the sixteenth century are the efforts of Theodor Brieger and Dietterle.

The history of Luther's trial by Rome and of the verdict in the bull of excommunication can today be written with much more precision than several years ago. Of special merit along this line is the work of Paul Kalkoff, who has given much attention to the history of the Diet of Worms and the events immediately preceding and following. But the credit of having started this

new investigation of Luther's trial belongs to Karl Müller, who calls attention to the necessity of ascertaining the principles usually applied on such occasions, of determining the personalities engaged upon Luther's case, and of distinguishing the various steps (denunciatio, accusatio, inquisitio) of the trial, as show especially in the history of the two papal bulls, the bull of threat and the bull of excommunication. It was the former which Luther publicly burned in Wittenberg. For a correct understanding of the Diet of Worms, Kalkoff's edition of Alexander's dispatches to the pope on that occasion and Werde's publication of the Acts of the Diet are indispensible.

For some time there has been much doubt as to the authenticity of Luther's famous dictum before the Worms Diet, "Here I take my stand; I cannot do otherwise; so help me God. Amen!" Several months ago Karl Müller of Tübingen, gave the matter a careful investigation with his usual thoroughness, and the result once for all is that Luther simply said at the end of his speech on that occasion, "God help me." The expression, "I cannot do otherwise; here I stand," occurs the following year (1522), in a Wittenberg print, but without any relation whatever to Luther. The words in their present order and in their application to Luther do not occur until 1545. But if we cannot now quote these words from Luther, we can quote his deeds. And this means more, for that Luther actually did take a stand on that occasion the history of almost four centuries has proved.

The occasion of the composition of the Reformation Hymn, Ein Feste Burg has been gradually forced back from the Coburg 1530 to the trip to Worms, 1521. Concerning Luther's much discussed return from Wartburg in 1522, while absolute proof is lacking, the widest acceptance has been given the opinion that Luther left the Wartburg contrary to the wish of the Elector, who merely desired his opinion concerning the disturbance in Wittenberg.

With reference to Luther's views and activity in the third decade of the sixteenth century new interest has been aroused and a more careful investigation has been instigated by Barge's two-volumed biography of Carlstadt (1906). Barge brings much that is new and instructive, but in the interpretation of his new material he has fallen in love with his hero and glorifies him at

the awful expense of Luther: Carlstadt, and not Luther, is made the real hero of the Reformation. This presentation called forth energetic protests from Brieger, Friedensburg, Hausrath, Kawerau, and Kolde. But the climax of the discussion is reached in Karl Müller's book Luther und Karlstadt (1907) in which he presents the results of a masterly investigation of Luther's position with regard to the mass, with regard to social questions, his return from Wartburg and his activity immediately thereafter. The discussion has not entirely ceased, but Barge stands alone in his views concerning Luther in the twenties.

In the meantime Luther's views and relations in almost every direction have received attention. Individual years of his life have been examined, thus 1525 by Kübel, and 1528 by Zimmerman. His relation to individual persons has been set forth anew, thus to Erasmus, Melanchthon, Spalatin, Staupitz, Zwingli, Philip of Hessen, the Electors, the Hohenzollerns. His relation to individual cities and provinces has been separately examined, thus to Naumberg, Würzburg, Würtemberg, Prussia, Schlesien. And his attitude, accomplishments, and influence in almost every department of human activity has been examined with more or less skill.

That Luther's weaknesses and mistakes should be more clearly defined in the blaze of recent research is only to be expected, for it has been observed that the taller the figure the longer the shadow it casts when light is shed upon it. For the tracing of these shadows in Luther's case we are chiefly indebted to the scholars of the Catholic world. And they have not painted the shadows too short or too bright. Already in 1883 Köstlin found it necessary to refute the keen bitter representations of Janssen in his Geschichte des deutschen Volkes am Ausgang des Mittelalters (re-edited by Pastor, 1904). And repeatedly since then Protestant scholars have felt themselves called upon to counteract the influence of Evers' six-volumed picture of life and character of Luther (1883-1891) and other pseudo-historical pretensions. But the climax of these persistent attacks was undoubtedly reached in 1904 when Denifel's Luther und Luthertum, u. s. w. appeared. The work had been expected, and because of Denifel's thorough acquaintance with mediaeval theology, his wide knowledge of literature, and his ready access to the sources as unterarchivar to the pope, rather fond hopes were entertained. But alas! it was found to be a keen attack of passionate hate and bitterness, and provoked the most angry indignation in Protestant circles. Denifel takes Luther by storm and compels him literally to wear bristles and go on all fours. And in the same whirl-pool with Luther he involves the Protestant theologians of all times, but especially of the present. He presents the results of years of investigation with a plausible pretense of authority and exact method, but in the sharpest tones that a learned Tyrolese peasant could muster. According to his representations the Reformation arose from the sensuality of the so-called reformer, who being unable to gain control of his passions declared such control impossible, cast the entire burden upon the back of Christ, invented the fiction of righteousness through mere faith, and then using Christ as a sheltering screen and taking his ideal from among the very lowest of brutes, carried on a life of utter immorality, inebriety, and abandonment. Luther is accused of every sin and short-coming in the category of human weakness. His chief crime against civilization is that he dispelled the brightness and beauty of the fifteenth century, brought on the dismal darkness of the sixteenth century and plunged a large part of the Christian world into an interminable series of heretical divisions and quarreling sects. And so forth for 1340 pages.

Denifel's book might by reason of its roughness and intemperate tone have passed with little notice, if it had not come from such a learned and distinguished source, and if it had not been so widely heralded by the Catholic world as a veritable master-stroke. The discussion began at once. Catholic scholars were not unanimous in their favorable criticisms of Denifel. To their credit be it said that quite a number of them repudiated his manner and method. The first to answer on the Protestant side were Seeberg and Harnack. Then came Kolde with a keen analysis of a long row of historical errors on Denifel's part and an energetic refutation of his out-spoken Aristotelian-scholastic method. Walther took up the defense of Luther's theology, Seeberg and Ihmels assisting. And quite a host of others entered the field, many to make personal self-defense against per-

1909]

sonal attacks, and for once all parties of Lutheranism found themselves united against this common foe. Very few were willing to admit even as much as Köhler and Kawerau, that there was anything whatever of positive instruction in Denifel's work. Denifel survived the appearance of his book only one year, and the sharper, more direct criticisms ceased. The posthumous edition of his work has been moderated in tone and in part reconstructed. And now that the smoke of the battle has lifted, it can scarcely be denied that ground has been gained. Protestant historians find themselves busied with new problems in consequence of this outburst. When the ultramontane writers set up the thesis that Luther's later assertions concerning his life in the cloister and concerning his experiences as a monk are highly unreliable and self-contradictory,-a pure fiction trumped up to explain his own disreputable action, the Protestant historians can refute it only by a most careful detailed investigation of Luther's theological development, a problem for whose solution the source materials are no longer lacking. In this connection it is also necessary to examine thoroughly Luther's veracity, his way of expressing himself, his memory, his temperament, and in fact his entire personal and psychological constitution. And when it is asserted that no such condition of things existed as Luther pretended to "reform," it falls to the defense to ascertain exactly what the state of affairs really was, both in the life and in the thought of the late Middle Ages and of the sixteenth century. When Luther is accused of abject ignorance in theology because he was so poorly versed in Thomas Aquinas, it becomes necessary to inquire what constituted a proper standard of theological knowledge in Luther's time. That an acquaintance with Thomas was no such standard in Germany seems certain. But did Luther see nothing in the theology of the papal church, but the nominalism of Duns Scotus? And who were the theologians that influenced him? In short, we find ourselves confronted with the task of exploring more thoroughly the entire background of Luther's activity, to arrive at more accurate standards of judgment, and to estimate more clearly the various influences that affected him. This will lead far back into the Middle Ages.

These are the lines along which the investigation has been pro-

ceeding for the last few years. Already many results have appeared; to recount them would require a long chapter. The most strenuous efforts are being devoted to the years of Luther's unrest and his gradual advance along the road which finally ended in the open breach with Rome. And we are now on a fair way to trace the cause, course, and result of the battle between the two eras as it was fought out within the high-spirited soul of the Augustinian monk. Without doubt the most valuable single product of the entire discussion thus far is that grand work by Wilhelm Walther, Für Luther wider Rom (1906). Walther had some time ago published a series of articles (Luther im neuesten römischen Gericht, 1883-92, and Das 6. Gebot und Luthers Leben. 1893) in Luther's defense and now upon this latest assault he extends his studies to cover all the points in question. In a stately volume of 775 pages he takes up one by one the host of accusations brought against Luther and by thoroughly scientific procedure presents the case for the defense. It is meant to be a reference book from which a correct appreciation of Luther's character and the solutions for the various problems of his life may be gathered from the sources correctly interpreted. end it is conveniently fitted with registers of the various passages of Luther's works, Erlangen and Weimar editions, and of Janssen's quotations of Luther as well as Denifel's. The volume serves as a valuable commentary to some of the most difficult passages in Luther's works. It strikes a new cord in confessional polemics and shows the utter unprofitableness and unreasonableness of dealing in excerpt commodities and secondhand quotations trimmed to order. Walther's hand-book is the fullest embodiment of the results of recent research on the points concerned and (supplemented by Hagermann's history of Luther im katholischen Urteil, 1906) may be considered the most complete refutation of all ultramontane charges. Future biographies will be obliged to make large note not only of Walther's work, but also of the numerous other positive results of this vigorous confessional controversy.

One more factor must be noted in even the most summary review of recent discussion concerning Luther. We refer to the new interpretation and valuation of Luther's theology which made its appearance about two years ago. It is intimately asso-

ciated with the name of the Heidelberg dogmatician Ernst Tröltsch, the prolific energetic representative of the method of comparative religions. In examining the significance of the Protestant Reformation for the rise of the modern era Tröltsch takes: occasion to estimate the value of Luther's ideas as measured by the most advanced standards of our enlightened day. He finds that Luther was thoroughly a child of the Middle Ages. "old Protestantism" which Luther established was at least no better than mediaeval Catholicism. The real modern world with its "new Protestantism" dates its beginning from the age of enlightenment in the eighteeenth century, and what of value it received from the sixteenth century came from the Anabaptists. As for Luther his supernaturalism places him in the Middle Ages. Instead of the Pope he made the Bible an authority over the conscience. Instead of monkish asceticism which flees the world he preached an inner asceticism of self-denial and separation from the world. For the Catholic infusion of grace through the Church he substituted the objective distribution of grace by the Church. In his use of the State to compel the reception of his religious ideas he made no advance on the Church-State-ism of the Catholic regime. So that the modern world owes vastly more to Sebastian Franck and Erasmus than it does to Luther. The only merit of Luther's Reformation is that it overcame the mediaeval conception of the sacraments, broke the power of theuniversal papal monarchy, and realized the human and personal in religion.

This conception is brought forth by a very interesting combination of the most varied elements in the spirit of the times. We cannot here stop to trace them. Tröltsch writes the history of ideas, and that too from the stand-point of a dogmatician. His presentation is a return to the speculative history-writing of Hegel. It is the old story: everything real is reasonable (logical) and conversely, Luther's theology is merely a reconstruction of mediaeval ideas; it gives only new solutions to the old Catholic problems, and the small modern element which it contains comes into consideration only when the first and classic form of Protestantism has been broken through and overcome. In short, the mediaeval in Luther lies in the fact that he represents an energetic supernaturalism.

This speculation by Tröltsch was a little too new for even the most ardent seekers after news. And very few (we mention Köhler and Hermelink) have dared to follow even in the distance. But it was presented with such a rich mastery of modern thought and as a part of such an admirably closed system that the effect was startling. It was a bold venture and has attracted much attention. The criticisms have nearly all been unfavorable (thus e. g., Brieger, Kattenbusch, Loofs, Böhmer), and there is no danger that this new conception will become common property of Protestant theology. As yet nothing of special importance has appeared bearing directly on the subject (with the possible exception of Loofs' rectorate-address Luthers Stellung zum Mittelalter und zur Neuzeit 1907), but it has received considerable attention from the scientific reviews and from the lecturing desk, and we have reason to believe that it will not be long before a distinct literature on the subject will arise. That the supernatural plays a large part in Luther's theology will be gladly admitted, and indeed in this respect Protestantism and Catholicism are but two species of the same genius, the Christ religion. To remove this from Luther's theology gives not a new Protestantism, but something entirely removed from Protestantism. It is true that Luther used the old forms, but he filled them with an entirely new content, and that is enough to give him his significance for all time. It is not claimed for Luther that he founded a new religion, but it is claimed that the changes he wrought penetrate deep into the religious life, and lead back to Christ. Nevertheless, the whole question will be subjected to a thorough investigation in this new light. Much that has hitherto been taken for granted now calls for exact The evangelical character of Luther's work must be examined. What was the exact nature and content of his protest? What was his aim and what his influence? Did he succeed in his purpose to restore apostolic Christianity? What significance is to be assigned him in the history of theology and in the history of civilization? What is the debt that the modern world owes to his Reformation, theologically and otherwise? Incidentally be it remarked, that the second and final volume of Arnold Berger's biography of Luther, in kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung that form of presentation which has become quite popular today, is promised for 1909 (first volume 1895) and will certainly deal with this question, but probably from a point of view more ethical than theological.

The latest Reformation history by Theodore Brieger in 1907 (in Pflugk-Harttung's Weltgeschichte, Bd. 4, Das religiöse zeitalter, 1500-1650) emphasizes the fact that Luther's appearance did mark the beginning of a new era, because he carried through principles that were really and vitally new as compared with the conditions all about him: he brought the knowledge that the relationship of the individual to the kingdom of God is an immediate one; he restored the truth that God is not an angry and vengeful God, but a loving, gracious Father,-he dispensed with the clumsy apparatus of propitiation, and rediscovered to humanity the fundamental fact of God's grace and Christ's atoning death. But, says Brieger, when it came to the matter of securing permanent footing and making propaganda for these splendid doctrines Luther was obliged by the opposition measures of the Catholics and the extreme tendencies of the radicals to change his plans somewhat, and to make concessions to existing conditions, especially politically. But we may add, these limitations of the original program were not fundamental, and it is certain that if Luther had entirely severed himself from the soil of his day the great truths which he sought to plant would have taken no root and under the scorching sun of opposition his influence would have been entirely lost, and the Reformation would have awaited some other day.

And so the work continues. Some points remain obscure. Many questions are calling for answers. But the pen is busy, and the probability is that when the fourth centennial of the ninety-five theses is celebrated in 1917 the learned and literary world will be able to present abundant evidence in assured results of the uprightness and moral integrity of Martin Luther, the tremendous lasting significance of his theology, and the world's incalculable debt to his Reformation, primarily religious, but pervading all branches of civilization.

Berlin, Germany.

#### ARTICLE VII.

## SOME NEW LIGHT CONCERNING THE SCHWABACH ARTICLES.

BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.

When Melanchthon at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530, prepared the Augsburg Confession, his main source for the first part (articles 1 to 21) of that document were the so-called Schwabach Articles. We have always been told—and it has been taught in the theological schools since generations—that the Schwabach articles had been written on the basis of the Marburg Articles, immediately or soon after the colloquy with Zwingli which took place at Marburg on the 4th October, 1529. The usual representation is this: In a letter dated the 28th of September (1) which must have reached Marburg on the 4th of October, the Elector instructed Luther, Melanchthon and Jonas, after their business at Marburg was finished, to meet him at Schleiz, or in case he should already have left(2) to follow him to another place about which they would receive further information. The purpose of this meeting between the Elector and his theologians had been to write articles of doctrine for the Schwabach Convention. But the Elector had changed his plan. Luther and his colleagues did not find him at Schleiz. Nevertheless, before leaving for Wittenberg they had drawn up the articles (probably at Eisenach, October 7th), and sent them to the Elector at Torgan. Such is the representation in a reliable work like Moeller-Kawerau III., 103 (1907); also Th. Kolde in R. E. (3) XVIII, 2. Others (Riederer, Heppe) believe that Luther wrote these Schwabach articles about the 5th of October, before he left Marburg. But by all historians of the Reformation period it was regarded as an indisputable fact that the more copiously writ-

<sup>(1)</sup> Enders VII, 163.

<sup>(2)</sup> At Schleiz the Elector had a meeting with the Markgrave of Brandenburg for the purpose of agreeing on what they, at the approaching Schwabach convention on October 16th, wanted to demand of the South German cities who had more or less been sympathizing with Zwingli as requirements for admission into a confederation against the Roman Catholic powers.

ten Schwabach articles had been composed after the Marburg Articles, and on the basis of the latter. Compared with the Marburg articles the Schwabach articles are far more pointed concerning the differences between Luther and Zwingli. theran conception is expressed in the strongest terms. been taken by many as an indication that Luther, after more thinking over the differences between him and Zwingli, took advantage of the occasion offered him by the Elector to correct his own too mild statements given in the Marburg articles and therefore chose the strongest terms to express the contrast, not only in the Lord's Supper, but also concerning Christology and the doctrine of original sin. Kolde(3) explains the stronger expressions of the Schwabach Articles by pointing to the fact that here had to be stated in which things the princes and cities must agree in order to establish a league, while in the Marburg Articles Luther simply stated in how far an agreement between him and Zwingli had been reached.

But this traditional view of the priority of the Marburg Articles and that the Schwabach Articles were written either yet in Marburg or on the journey back to Wittenberg, perhaps in Eisenach, as an hurriedly carried out revision of the Marburg articles seems now to be doomed forever by a thorough investigation of the question by Prof. von Schubert of Heidelberg, Germany. He first communicated the result of his investigations in a lecture delivered before the Society for Reformation History in Cassel, (4) and now he has followed it up with a very scholarly treatise of the subject in the August issue of the Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte (Gotha 1908). In a very discerning manner and by quoting important evidences from the Weimar, Ansbach, Nurenberg and Marburg archives he undertakes to prove that the Schwabach articles were written in July or Aug. by the Wittenberg theologians long before the Marburg Articles, and that therefore their composition was altogether independent of the latter. Von Schubert writes: "The whole case is a striking illustration of the fact how on the strength of a mere suggestion

<sup>(3)</sup> R. E. XVIII, 2.

<sup>(4)</sup> Printed as number 96 of the publications of the Society, 1908.

(wissentschaftliche Suggestion), without any scientific ground, a view can maintain itself from generation to generation. (5)

Prof. von Schubert begins his refutation of the old theory with emphasizing that although the Elector wrote that letter to Luther referred to above, we do not find one word in it concerning articles of doctrine to be composed. It must have been for an altogether different purpose that the Elector wanted to see his theologians in Schleiz. At that time nearly all political questions had a religious feature also, and a prince would ask the advice of his theologians on many occasions. Von Schubert inclines to the opinion that it was the appearing of the Turks before Vienna and the plan of the Elector to raise, together with the Catholic princes, an army for the support of Austria, which he wanted to discuss from the religious aspects with Luther and the other theologians as the counsellors of his conscience. For soon after Luther met the Elector at Torgau, all was in consternation over the report of the approaching Turks. If we keep in mind, how from now on and for quite a while, Luther in his letters and in his writings knows of no other theme than the Turk invading Europe, and how his anticipations of the horrors then awaiting the Christian countries even affects his health, then the supposition of Prof. von Schubert seems highly probable.

Our historian continues his investigation by calling our attention to the inner reasons which have been quoted in favor of the traditional theory. It was asserted that the Schwabach articles represent a revision of the Marburg articles. But, says von Schubert, the question is: on which side the priority and on which the "revision" (Ueberarbeitung) would have to be sought; and he insists after careful comparison of the articles and their contents" that in particulars the more careful expression and the ampler argumentation, also by proof of Scripture and scholarly dealing with heresies of the old church, and in general the more systematic exhibition is contained in the Schwabach Articles." If we look for traces of a hurried composition, this could be found only in the Marburg Articles. It is true, the Schwabach Articles are more intense, and, at places, even caustic over against the Zwinglian views; but this very fact,

<sup>(5)</sup> Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte, p. 344.

says von Schubert, makes it psychologically impossible that Luther, only a few days after he had written the mild Marburg articles, should have written this Schawbach document. Of course, at Marburg, he did not yield to Zwingli the least, and to the Strassburg theologians he spoke of "the other spirit." Yet Luther expressed over and over again his satisfaction with what had been accomplished. He had feared that there were differences between him and Zwingli also regarding the person of Christ and original sin, and in these things Zwingli had given him satisfactory statements. Concerning the difference in respect to "the Lord's Supper" Luther, in the last of the Marburg articles, had written as follows: "And although we have at this time not yet reached an agreement as to whether the true body and blood of Christ be bodily in bread and wine, yet shall one part show Christian charity towards the other, as far as can be done with a good conscience, and both parts shall pray to God, the Almighty, that He, through His spirit, may grant us perfect harmony."(6) To his wife he wrote on the 4th of October: "Our friendly colloquy is now ended, and in nearly all articles we are agreed." To Gerbel in Strassburg he wrote: "Oh that all the rest could be done away with through Christ." On their journey home from Marburg he and Melanchthon expressed in many letters their satisfaction over what had been accomplished. (7) Luther was willing to quit the controversy. Prof. von Schubert continues: "The possibility that Luther should have written out of such frame of mind the seventeen Schwabach Articles full of pointed allusions against those with whom he had just several days ago succeeded in adjusting difficulties; pointed allusions also in such articles in which the opponents had given him satisfactory explanations, and misunderstandings had been removed, as for instance in Christology and the doctrine of originalsin; allusions full of the tendency to shut out and to exclude in a moment where he has the hope of full agreement: the possibility may perhaps not be disputed, yet for the probability I cannot see much chance, not with Luther's frank and chivalrous character. For would it not have been treacherous, and

<sup>(6)</sup> Kolde, Die Augsburgische Konfession, etc., p. 122.
(7) Enders, VII, 166. Erl. Ed. 54, 107. Enders, VIII, 68 s., 174, 177. Corp. Ref. I, 1102, 1106.

perfidious if immediately after 'the friendly colloquy at Marburg,' to speak with Luther himself, after the codification of what they had found to have in common, the Wittenberg theologians at a wink from the Elector had prepared this instrument of division, and at that on the basis of a document in which they had just stipulated their points of agreement? Have we not also found this trait which could be understood only from stubborn irreconcilableness as a stain in Luther's character, which, of course, we must not try to remove by clever explanations, but which we would gladly see eradicated by history itself?" (354 s. g.)

After thus the old theory has been successfully refuted, Prof. von Schubert goes on to give us his own conception of this part of church history. He insists that on the subject under discussion the sources are not at all so silent as, under the influence of the traditional view, they have seemed to be. The first traces of these Articles of faith which were intended to be the basis of a political confederation between the Lutheran princes and cities of South Germany, are found in a document (Bedenken) presented on the 16th of July by the Markgrave George of Brandenburg. It was written for the proposed meeting at Schleiz where some preliminary work had to be done for the convention at Schwabach to which the South German cities were invited. Of this document only the title page has been preserved. But from a reply of the Elector we know of the contents. The Elector consented to the suggestion of the Markgrave, namely, that articles of faith ought to be the basis of the agreement between the several parties. (8) Prof. von Schubert thinks that possibly then already the articles were in existence, because in the reply of the Elector (9) the remark is found that the articles are contained in a special envelope and sent with the same mail.

But where will we have to look for the author of these articles? About this the Markgrave had already written that the theologians of his uncle, the Elector, would be quite able to do such work. (10) It is more than probable that it was to this task to which Melanchthon refers in his letter to Camerarius on the 26th

<sup>(8)</sup> Kolde, Der Tag von Schleiz und die Entstehung der Schwabacher Artikel, 102. Schornbaum, Politik Georgs. 84. Compare von Schubert 370.

<sup>(9)</sup> Preserved in the Ansbach archives (Ansb. Rel. A. t. VII, fol. 41 a.)(10) v. Schubert, 373.

of July: The Elector had commanded the Wittenberg theologians to compose the most important articles of faith, and Melanchthon writes: Ego nunc rixor cum turbulentis quibusdam. Ad hace institui enchiridion dogmatum Christianorum, ut, quid de omnibus fidei articulis senserimus, posteribus judicare possit. This had been neglected too much by the church fathers who had not given us the sum of the Christian doctrine in order. Perhaps such writings had simply not been preserved. At any rate, to-day it is exceedingly difficult for us to find out the system of their doctrinal views. Concerning the divinity of Christ their testimony is somewhat clearer. (11)

As another witness of the fact that these articles must have been in existence about the end of July Prof. von Schubert quotes Luther who in the name of the other Wittenbergers replied to the Elector concerning the objections of Philipp of Hesse, who wanted also Zwingli to be taken into the confederation: "Therefore it is our opinion that we leave it with the articles which have been composed for the occasion." (12)

Finally, to get the terminus ad quem for the composition of the Schwabach articles von Schubert points to the journey of Luther, Melanchthon and Jonas to Torgau on the 15th and 16th of September. In anticipation of the journey Jonas writes on the 14th of September: "There we will be engaged with the most important matters." (Kawerau, Briefwechsel I, 128). Herein the approaching days of Marburg, Schleiz must have been discussed, and, at the latest, here the confession must have received its definite form.

There is one feature in the arguments of Prof. von Schubert which at first sight seem to stamp them as not sufficiently conclusive. One will ask: Why were these Schwabach articles, the first Lutheran confession of faith, not more spoken of? Why do Melanchthon, Luther and Jonas not write of them in their letters with a much clearer language? Why did Luther and Melanchthon not propose them as the basis of their discussion in Marburg? Why were they not made public by the Lutherans until Luther published them in Koburg at the time of the Augs-

<sup>(11)</sup> Corp. Ref. 1084.

<sup>(12)</sup> Erl. Ed. 54, 79. Enders, VII, 110.

burg Diet, and then only because a bookseller had taken advantage in publishing an unreliable manuscript? But here it must be kept in mind that these Schwabach Articles were composed as a political document, as a document to serve as the basis of an agreement between the Elector and the Markgrave on the one hand and the South German cities on the other. An alliance against the Emperor and the Catholic princes of Germany was planned. (13) As a political document it was kept secret and spoken of with discretion in the correspondence of those who had been engaged in its composition.

If the arguments of Prof. von Schubert can not be called absolutely conclusive, because of the discretion spoken of, yet it is the best supported view and will from now on be regarded as such, because the traditional view was altogether without foundation. In a letter to the writer Prof. Kawerau, one of our first authorities on the history of the Reformation, said of Prof. von Schubert's article, which he regards as very important: "Damit verschiebt sich das Bild der Vorarbeiten fuer die Augusburgische Konfession ganz bedeutend."

But what is our interest in the question: Which of the two documents was written first and which second? In the history of the Augsburg Confession and in the interpretation of its text it has always been very interesting to observe to what extent these documents have been used by Melanchthon. And if we, in the Augustana, meet a phrase employed either in the Schwabach or in the Marburg articles then the suggestion concerning the native meaning of such thought has much to do with the question: Which of the documents can claim priority to the other?

Atchison, Kansas.

<sup>(13)</sup> Of course, we know that the purpose was not accomplished in Schwabach, the cities could not agree with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as stated in the Articles.

## ARTICLE VIII.

# BENEFICIARY EDUCATION IN THE GENERAL SYNOD

BY REV. C. B. GRUVER.

Beneficiary education is a charitable provision made for the benefit of indigent students who desire to procure an education. Specifically, it is the financial aid given by the Church to worthy students to enable them to prepare for the ministry. In the Genreal Synod the aid usually given is from \$50 to \$200 a year, according to the needs of the student. A rule has also been adopted by most of our Synods, that in order to be eligible to the aid of the Church, a student must be of irreproachable character, a member of the Church, in need of financial aid to continue his studies, and be prepared to enter the freshman class of one of our recognized colleges. The wisdom of this rule from past experience, and present educational advantages in our high schools, can hardly be questioned. It is also a well recognized fact that a large proportion of our General Synod ministers received aid from the Church to prepare themselves for the preaching of the Word, and that without this timely assistance by the Church, most of them could not have entered the work of their choice. For the six years, from 1879 to 1885, the late Rev. E. Breidenbaugh, in an article in the Lutheran Observer, stated that "86 young men entered the ministry from our two institutions at Gettysburg and Selins Grove, and 50 of these, or about three-fifths of the entire number received aid from the Church in thir preparation." Without any further statistics at hand we may say, that this is probably a fair proportion throughout the entire Church. We are convinced the number has not decreased in later years, and it clearly shows that a large proportion of our General Synod Churches are dependent for their existence as well as for the preaching of the Word, upon ministers who were educated by the aid of the Church. If these had not been aided into the ministry by the Church, at least one-half our congregations would have no existence, and if they now would demit the ministry at least one-half of all our pulpits would at once be vacant. The same author quoted above, also states, that the "average contribution given each student was \$165 a year." It would thus appear that if each student was a beneficiary of the Church for six years it cost the Church in round numbers about, \$1000 to aid him in preparing for his life's work. That again is a liberal estimate as many of our beneficiaries received aid only two or three years. Admitting that it cost the Church \$1000 for each one of her beneficiaries, is the result commensurate with the cost? Has the result in ministers, churches and communicant members justified the outlay of means? We think it has.

Would it have been better for the General Synod only to have one-half as many churches, and these to be supplied by ministers who were able to educate themselves? How about the other Shall we cease our beneficiary work and let this multitude What about our two hundred vacancies in the General Synod at this time, for which we have no available supplies? How shall we meet the vacancies caused by death, and the many openings calling for ministers, when our present force is inadequate? What shall we do with our five millions of unchurched Lutherans in this country, and how about the thousands of Lutheran immigrants coming to our shores annually? In all of this work the General Synod is responsible with the other General Bodies of our Church to give them the Word of God. Appalling as the situation now is, what would it have been had the Church not come to the aid of these young men and prepared them for the work? It simply means that many of our most talented and efficient ministers would never have been known. Their attention would have been diverted to other callings, and many of our best churches and congregations would have no existence. The five millions of unchurched Lutherans in the United States would be augmented by at least another million.

As a matter of fact there are not enough young men in the General Synod, willing to enter the ministry, who are able to educate themselves. The causes of this have been attributed to excessive work, causing much weariness of the body and anxiety of mind, inadequate support, exacting demands by congregations, sacrifices that are required by ministers, no possible chance to accumulate any reserve fund for old age, with prospects of be-

1909]

ing set aside in old age, etc. On account of these things men of means seldom choose the ministry for a profession, and as long as these causes remain, there will be no remedy outside of beneficiary education. Even with the aid the Church offers the number of worthy young men, willing to make the sacrifices, is entirely inadequate to the demand. The claim to support beneficiary education in our Church is urgent. Stop this channel and you clog the wheels of the Church. Take out those who received aid and we become a weak factor indeed in the great work assigned to our care. Until enough young men, able to educate themselves, offer themselves for the ministry, to meet the demands of our Church, we see no other remedy. What we are as a Church in the United States is largely due to beneficiary education. As long as the divine commisison stands to "make disciples of all nations," it is the duty of the Church to provide an adequeate ministry to do this work, and if there are not enough men of means called who are willing to prepare themselves for the ministry, the Church must aid those who are called, "for how shall they hear without a preacher?" This we believe is in accord with the teachings of the Divine Word. It is also in accord with the practice of the Levitical Schools which were beneficiary in their character. In the Mediaeval Universities, "stipendia" were established for the aid of poor students struggling to prepare themselves for other useful professions, as well as for service in the Church.

In our day most institutions whether controlled by the Church or State, are largely beneficiary in their operations. The buildings and equipments are frequently provided by bequests, voluntary contributions, State appropriations or taxes. In many instances professorships are endowed, scholarships are frequently provided for, and in some instances tuition is free. In all these institutions none of the students pay sufficiently to meet all the expenses of their education. All students are largely beneficiaries of the institutions where they pursue their studies, and where such ample provision has been made for them. Statistics are sufficiently accurate to show that the income derived from fees paid by the students for tuition, etc., are only about one-third of the entire expense of the institutions. The remaining two-thirds of the expense is derived from legacies, bequests,

268

[April

endowments, State aid, and other miscellaneous sources, so that every student is a beneficiary of the institution where he is educated of about two-thirds of the cost of his education. This is especially true of our colleges, universities, and higher institutions of learning.

This is also true of our State Normal institutions, and the graduates are largely beneficiaries of the State. The buildings and other expenses are largely met by State appropriations, and in no instance does the tuition derived from the students meet the expenses of the institution. Besides this, in some of the States, there are benefits allowed for students who agree to teach in the State, and a donation or bonus is given at the time of graduation. Even our public schools are largely beneficiary from the infant department to the city high school. Every scholar in our public schools, whether rich or poor, is a beneficiary of the State under our generous free school system. Large appropriations are made by the States, in some instances quite sufficient to meet the entire expense of buildings and teachers. Some of the States also furnish the books, apparatus, paper, pencils, etc., free of cost to each student. In such districts where taxes are laid, to make up the deficiency, it is usually only a small part of the entire expense. This is especially true of the poorer class, who are educated almost entirely at the expense of a generous public. It is not an unusual occurrence for a poor man to educate his entire family, giving all his children a high school education at the nominal sum of a dollar or two a year. In some instances these privileges are granted entirely free of cost, and the parents are compelled to give their children the benefits of the provisions made for them, by a system of compulsory education. Provisions are also made by each State where the deaf, the blind, the weak-minded and degenerate are educated and cared for at the expense of the State. These are to all intents and purposes the beneficiaries of the State. So also we have homes for orphans, hospitals and asylums, homes for the aged and infirm, deaconess houses, etc., where persons are educated or cared for according to their needs, at the expense of the Church or State which provided the institutions. The benefits of our beneficiary system are more especially seen in our military and naval academies, where the government seeks to provide the entire expense of educating her sons for the army and navy. It is estimated that each lieutenant for the army, educated at West Point, and each midshipman for the navy, educated at Annapolis, costs the government from \$5000 to \$6000. These are beneficiaries of the government for the full expense of their education, including board and clothing. At these institutions each student receives from \$500 to \$600 each year for personal expenses. This does not include the cost of buildings, equipments, interest on the money invested, nor professors' salaries, and many other expenses for which the government provides annually.(1)

It is clearly seen that the Church has not made as ample provision for the education of her sons as the State. The Church simply seeks to assist worthy students after they have passed through the high schools, so as to be able to pursue their studies in higher institutions, which they could not do without this aid. She does not furnish the entire expense of an education. It is simply a question of how far a student shall be assisted in procurring an education. Shall beneficiary aid be given beyond that furnished by the State in our grammar and high schools, and shall it be extended through our colleges and seminaries? We have seen that the government furnishes such aid in her own institutions, for certain objects, and one might be led to ask whether the ministry is not of equal importance? The moral right to furnish such aid cannot be denied, and if the government cannot see the importance of such aid, the Church should. We should not do less to prepare men for the ministry, than the government does to prepare men for the army and navy. I submit as a matter of Christian consciousness whether to educate men in the latest and best methods of slaving human beings, many of whose souls are hurled into eternity without Christ, is of greater importance to us as a nation, than to educate men to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ to save their souls? In view of these facts, it is clear that the education of worthy students for the ministry has not received the attention the cause demands. There seems to be a favoritism for the other professions. Even in the General Synod there is a loyalty for the maintenance of State institutions, and the support of secular students, which cannot be secured for our Church Colleges and the support of our

<sup>(1)</sup> See Church Review 1887, June Number, Article by Rev. Fred. Harriman

beneficiary students. Our members would not submit to the same methods of securing the funds to support our Church beneficiaries as are employed to support the beneficiaries of the government.

The objection sometimes heard, that to receive aid from the Church to prepare for the ministry is somewhat humiliating, and a reflection on the ability or energy of the beneficiary, is not well founded, for all students are beneficiaries, more or less, for an education. For a young man to earn enough to see him through college and seminary is now well nigh impossible. The two or three months in the summer is too short a time to secure paying positions and the employments which were open to students a few years ago are now closed. Skilled workmen with special training are now required in nearly all departments of work. In most instances where a student earns his own way into the ministry his best days are taken before he is able to begin life's work, and the days of his usefulness are impeded, or delayed beyond what is wise. Quite frequently a student's health is impaired by making sacrifices and privations beyond endurance. Moreover, there can be no more reason why reflections should be cast on a student who receives aid in preparing for the ministry, than upon students who are prepared at the government's expense for other professions. The objection seems to point to a jealousy or prejudice, on the part of such who did not need any aid in preparation, beyond our high schools, in order to reflect on those who did, and thus bring beneficiary education into disrepute. No one casts reflections on the officers of our army and navy because they were educated at the expense of the government at a cost of five to six times as much as any of the beneficiaries of the Church receive. Their uniforms are evidences of the generosity of the government in providing for their education. They wear them with just dignity and pride, and we respect them for it. They are a mark of honor, and not of humiliation. Should we not equally respect and honor those whom we have aided into the ministry by our generosity? They rank equal in ability and success with those who did not need such aid and are so regarded by the Church. Some of our ablest ministers in the General Synod were beneficiaries of the Church, and it is no discredit to them whatever. They have done a noble work, and the Church should feel highly honored to be able topoint to them as the products of beneficiary education.

It may be argued that not all who were aided into the min-· istry have been a credit to the Church. This may be met by saying that others who were not beneficiaries of the Church havealso failed. It furnishes no argument against a good cause. It simply calls for greater care in selecting our candidates for the ministry. The divine injunction to "lay hands suddenly on no one," is still in place. In some instances it might have been better if less persuasion into the ranks of the ministry had been employed, and more convictions of duty felt by the candidate. When the evidences of a divine call are not clear and positive it is always better not to encourage a candidate though he be ever so bright and talented, than to assist him into a profession for which he is not suited, and upon which he will bring discredit in the end. That there are instances where enthusiastic ministers have overstepped their calling by bringing undue pressure upon young men to enter the ministry, and have thus brought discredit on the Church, there is no doubt, but it is no argument against beneficiary education. It was a good thing that Christ selected the apostles even though there was a Judas among them. If they had not been selected, Judas' character might not have been so forceably brought out, but the work of the apostles would not have been done. It is no argument that our government should cease to coin genuine golden eagles because there havebeen counterfeits. The very facts of the counterfeits are proofs of the genuine. So also beneficiary education is justified, and we can see no reason to discontinue a work so signally blessed of the Lord in building up his Church. As long as the divine command is not fulfilled, and enough young men who are able to educate themselves do not offer themselves for the ministry, there is urgent need for beneficiary education. At this timethe most serious results would follow the discontinuance of beneficiary education in our Church. As in the past, so also in the future, we will continue to be dependent on our beneficiaries for our supply of ministers, and with the influx of Lutherans coming to this country annually, our General Synod will need a well regulated system of beneficiary education in order to meet the demands made upon us, for years to come.

Our colleges are not sufficiently endowed to give free tuition, even to such worthy young men who are preparing for the ministry. Our self-preservation as a Church demands that if we cannot furnish a more adequate support, we at least meet this deficiency by a well-regulated system of beneficiary education, and aid such worthy students as will contribute to our future strength and prosperity. We must arise to our privilege and inaugurate such a wise policy in our system of beneficiary education as will give to our young men preparing for the ministry such aid and advantages as the cause demands. Until our colleges are more liberally endowed the situation will become more grave as years roll on. This has been so well stated in an article in the Lutheran World of Dec. 22nd, 1908, by Prof. Holmes Dysinger, D.D., of our Western Theological Seminary, that I de-

sire to quote in part. He says:

272

"The Board of Education was organized by the General Synod of the Lutheran Church for the special purpose of fostering the cause of higher education within that body, in order that it may be provided with a ministry adequate in numbers, qualifications and efficiency to meet the pressing demands of the times, and have an intelligent, loyal and consecrated laity to prosecute its State provision and private beneficence have multiplied opportunities for higher education, but not such as the Church requires for fulfillment of her mission through the enlargement of her borders and the spiritual upbuilding of her members. These schools, excellent as many of them are, in many particulars, do not, and possibly cannot, furnish the Church with the kind of a ministry or laity necessary to her perpetuity. the Church must do in the main in her own schools, not simply in her own theological seminaries, which is self-evident, but in her own colleges, manned and supported by her own people and the funds furnished by them? Whatever may be the cause it is an undisputed fact that the schools not controlled and supported by the Church directly send but a small proportion of their students into the Gospel ministry. If the Lutheran Church in this country is to have a ministry sufficient and capable of meeting the demands made upon her it is absolutely necessary that her schools of higher education be supported generously. must be equal to the best in efficiency. To this end the Board

of Education contributes by its assistance. Weak schools mean a weak ministry, and a weak ministry means a declining Church and dying congregations. The vitality of a particular Church even may be correctly measured by her willingness and efforts to support those agencies that are essential to the maintenance of her life. The congregation that does not have one or more of its young men at college and in preparation for the ministry, to say the least, is not making its best contribution to Christ's cause upon earth. And the one that neglects to suport the colleges and seminaries with the full amount due from apportionment or otherwise is withholding the sustenance that nourishes its own life."

Some things especially should demand the attention of our Church at this time.

We might mention greater care in the selection of our beneficiaries as one of these. The demand for ministers should not make the Church indifferent and loose as to their character and qualifications. While everything possible should be done to encourage worthy young men to enter the ministry, it is neither prudent nor right for ministers to go through their respective pastorates and select men for this purpose regardless of their mental and moral qualifications.

Young men whom the Lord wants He will call, and if they do not heed the call, there are grave doubts as to its genuineness or their fitness, or both. Personally, I do not believe the Lord wants men in the ministry who will not heed His call, unless special inducements are held out to them. None but such who show unmistakable evidence of natural ability and personal piety of a high order, should ever be encouraged to enter this high and holy office, and none should be received as beneficiaries of the Church unless they are actually in need of assistance, and are otherwise worthy.

So also great care should be taken in the division of funds. As the aim of our system of beneficiary education is simply to assist worthy young men into the ministry who are not able to make the necessary preparations without such aid, the best and most economical use of the funds entrusted to our care, should be made, so as to assist the greatest possible number. This is especially true when so many men are needed. A just and ade-

quate appropriation of funds is a great trust which must not be abused. It is the Lord's money and must be used judiciously. For the same reason strict measures should be adopted so as to secure the Church from loss. Loose methods in financing any department of church work are always detrimental to its best interests. There is no danger of the Church being too careful in securing proper safeguards against loss. Some of our Synods are too lax in their requirements. In each instance a judgment bond should be given collectible at any time, if necessary. No honest student will hesitate to sign such a bond. Moreover, it should be laid upon his conscience to pay the Church in full for benefits received if he becomes able. It is also essential that a uniform and well-regulated system of beneficiary education should be adopted by all our Synods so as to do justice to all. Our system has been faulty for lack of uniformity in the different Synods. Some of our Synods are more liberal in their benefits, and more loose in their requirements than others. Some will accept applicants which others will not. Some demand less preparation than others, so that our system of beneficiary education has not attained that degree of perfection and efficiency which the cause demands. It is an organization without a leader, a body without a head. It is too much after the order of a century ago. It has outlived its best days. The methods of the past are not equal to the demands of our day. It reminds us of the way our boys used to make stone fences, all haphazzard. There was no system about it. Each did his work by strenuous effort, but much as he pleased. What we need in our day is the best method we can get, and we are convinced we do not have it. The cry for more men for the ministry in the General Synod has gone out long and loud, but it has been the weak cry of an unorganized band of scouts and roamers, and not the effective shout of a well organized army of active men, with its generals and other officers, each in their respective places. Of course the men to fill up the ministerial ranks have not come as might be expected. There can be no better argument for the reorganization of the entire system. There is no more reason that each Synod should do its own beneficiary work and care for the benficiaries in its own territory, than it should care for the missions in its own territory, as was done before the Board of Home Missions was organized. We all see how much better the Board of Home Missions can manage the interests of our Home Mission field, than it could be done by our Synods. The old method of synodical oversight was not adapted to meet the demands of the growing Home Mission enterprise of our day, and had to give way to our present system. The results have fully justified the change. There is no doubt that with a similar change in our present system of beneficiary education a much greater work could be done, and the crying demand for more ministers would be met. Larger funds would be secured for this purpose, and the whole cause would be laid on the heart of the Church so as to appeal to her convictions of duty. Worthy young men having the ministry in view would feel their responsibility as they do not now. The cause demands greater attention than has been given it, for our Church has been greatly handicapped under our present system. Such a reconstruction of our entire system of beneficiary education as will be uniform throughout the Church, and just to all, cannot be brought about too soon to meet the growing demands laid upon us. It is possible that for the present the Board of Education might take the matter in charge, but the cause is of such vital importance that it will need a board of its own to meet its wants, and to regulate the work. The present demand for more ministers is such that no worthy young man should be turned aside, but greater care should be taken to determine the fitness of the applicant. The Lord's work is so urgent that we must make haste judiciously and discreetely, and not with the reckless indifference often shown.

Neither need we have any grave apprehensions concerning a superfluity of ministers. For the right kind there is always room, and there will never be more than the Lord wants to do His work. Our own selfishness, no doubt, would limit the number, and may we not attribute our present dearth, at least in part to this cause? The dread to be superseded is quite natural, and leads to apathy. To say the least, the Church has the key to the situation, and the present conditions will continue until the Church holds out inducements commensurate with the needs. A proper system of beneficiary education will not effect those unfortunates who, on account of the "age limit," and for vari-

276

[April

ous other reasons, are out of employment. Some of these are out of employment from choice. They prefer to remain idle rather than accept such positions as they are able to secure, though they are well able to do so. Others, no doubt, are not able to make the sacrifices that are demanded by the Church. Still others would gladly do so if a place were open for them. For all such the Church must make other provisions. The law of the "survival of the fittest" seems to hold here as elsewhere. But has it ever occurred that such congregations as remain vacant, rather than call such honored and successful ministers as are available, would scarcely accept those which they now refuse even if the number of our ministers were cut down onehalf? We admit the wrong, but the cause is not found in a superfluity of ministers. It must be sought elsewhere. We are convinced that our present system of beneficiary education needs reconstruction, in order to meet the needs of our Church, and if by this article a greater interest shall be created throughout the Church, the writer will have accomplished his purpose.

West Sand Lake, N. Y.

## ARTICLE IX.

# SOCIOLOGY AND THE PULPIT.

BY REV. W. C. HEFFNER, PH.D.

The propriety of associating two bodies of knowledge, usually considered independent, may be questioned by some and particularly by those who claim that the different disciplines are separated by a sharp line of demarkation. Specialization upon some particular phase of doctrine, truth, or body of knowledge during a considerable period of time, apparently establishes such a line. But this is more apparent than real, for the specialist draws information continually from other disciplines in order to advance his own, thus repeatedly overleaping the barrier seemingly set The average student, leaving an educational institution at graduation, departs under the impression that every subject he studied was an independent body of knowledge that bore no relation to the others. That one department of study should draw information from another and that all bodies of learning constitute a whole is incomprehensible to him. His natural conclusion is, that independent bodies of knowledge must remain separate and distinct and that the rendition of mutual assistance is detrimental to both. Now, no matter what effect years of specialization may have produced upon the mind of a specialist, or disjointed presentations of different disciplines upon that of the graduate, no one should pass judgments or draw conclusions until he has examined and viewed the matter from the opposite viewpoint, for all disciplines unite to form the whole of human knowledge and are not independent.

The propriety of the association may again be questioned because the sacred is jointed with the secular. The sacred desk from which is preached and taught the eternal truth of God for salvation is viewed as being lowered in joining it to participate in a body of scientific knowledge which the over-zealous religionist sometimes calls godless. A science is not lowering nor godless simply because it deals with a different set of phenomena. Psychology, history and language deal with phenomena that dif-

278

fer materially from those of the pulpit. Does anyone impute godlessness and lowering qualities to these? Sociology likewise deals with a different set of phenomena, but why should this be a warrant for saying that it is godless, or that the pulpit is lowered in association. It deals with the phenomena of human association. The pulpit is one of the resultants of this associating process. As an institution, it was called into existence to supply the moral and spiritual needs of associated humanity. Its source of supply is the Word of God. In bringing this to mankind's needs it draws every assistance possible from the older and long established sciences. If a new one has studied a set of phenomena inadequately studied by the older ones, and if these phenomena deal with a body of truth which has called the pulpit into existence, surely the latter should consider candidly the information which the new-comer brings, before passing judgment as to the results.

Whatever increases or clarifies a body of knowledge should be welcomed as we do a discovery or an invention. The discoverer reveals something already in existence; the inventor, by a new arrangement of existing materials, brings to light a product which formerly was unknown. The original is rapidly improved. Sometimes as many as a dozen different patent rights are issued at different times for a single machine, or some particular part thereof. A new patent right does not necessarily mean a new and independent machine, but an existing one improved and perfected so as to extend its efficiency and usefulness. We hail with acclaim these improvements, because they mean an increase of human happiness. We should do the same in the domain of knowledge. If sociology possesses something that will improve and increase the efficiency of the pulpit, then it is eminently proper that the latter should obtain it. If there is a mutual relation between the two, it should be cultivated. If both of them deal with the same subject, but from different viewpoints, then the barrier of independence should be broken down. If both deal with the same subject-humanity in group life-can not one aid the other? Can not the one enable the other to perform its mission more efficiently and satisfactorily? To a candid mind there can be no doubt, for it seeks truth everywhere. Let us withhold judgment until we shall have examined the theme and drawn conclusions.

Sociology is the scientific study of the phenomena of human association, and may be defined in brief as, The science of social phenomena...Again, we may say that it is the science of group life. The best, the most comprehensive and the most satisfactory definition is that of Prof. Giddings: "Sociology is an attempt to account for the origin, growth, structure and activities of society by the operation of physical, vital and psychical causes working in a process of evolution."(1) This definition is very serviceable to one who desires a clear conception and understanding of the nature and processes of society. However, a comprehensive view of the principles which constitute its foundations will give one a better idea of the science than the best formulated definition. It investigates causes and effects, demonstrates rules for social conduct and action and aims to reach a scientific conclusion as to the phenomena that arises in human association. (2) All that sociologists are doing at present is to correlate and organize the results of their investigations into a system of knowledge of human association, leaving the formulation of scientific definition for the future.

Recent advances in sociologic thought have shifted attention from "society" to "human association" for the purpose of clarity. The mystery which is sought to be solved is "human experience." (3) A similar shifting has occurred from "activities" to "phenomena," (4) because the latter embraces beliefs and feelings as well as activities. These two shifting processes have cleared away the confusion resulting from the differing concepts of "society" and the inadequate comprehensiveness of "activities," thus reducing the mystery itself to "the process of human association from its minutest to its largest phenomena." (5) A third shifting has been from the a priori to the historical method. A priori concepts grouped human association into disconnected epochs and investigated them separately. Further research, however, has disproved the epochal idea and demonstrated that

 <sup>(1)</sup> Giddings Principles of Sociology, p. 8.
 (2) Blackmar, Elements of Sociology, p. 13.

<sup>(3)</sup> Small, General Sociology, p. 184.

<sup>(4)</sup> Ross, Foundations of Sociology, p. 6.

<sup>(5)</sup> Small, General Sociology, p. 184.

one epoch or period shades into the other without any perceptible line of demarkation. A complete survey of all races and peoples showed that the social process is a continual advance from the crudest and simplest beginnings to the extremely complex structure of modern society. Historical researches have lifted the veil and revealed the fact that the progressive ennobling of mankind is the resultant of conflicts, assimilations and amalgamations. A minute analysis of the inherent phenomena proved the inadequacy of a priori methods and shifted investigations to the historical. This change is due more largely to the researches of Ratzenhofer than to those of any other man. Gumplowicz says: "Ratzenhofer's sociological theory remains an imperishable possession of science." (6)

There exists a tendency on the part of some inquirers into social matters to confuse sociology with socialistic schemes and utopias. These contain certain social features and are a part of the social process, but not the whole social process. Usually they embody a program, a panacea for all the ills of society, which in nine cases out of ten is revolutionary. Their object is not the improvement of existing society, but the construction of a new one upon the ruins of the old. Sociology studies scientifically all the phenomena of human association, traces their causes, formulates their laws and aims to improve society along the existing and natural relations of humanity. The social process is continuous, progressive, ever adjusting itself, though slowly, to the natural and psychic changes in the world of human experience. Utopic and socialistic schemes endeavor to accomplish within a short day what naturally requires years. Society cannot be reformed in a day. The failure of past experiments with these schemes is sufficenit disproof of their inability to effect any lasting social reform. Being at variance with the objects of scientific sociology they must not be taken for the science.

Another tendency on the part of some students of society that produces confusion in sociology, is the use of the term *Christian Sociology*. This is substituting the species for the genus. No species can be greater than its genus. Because one writer emphasizes one phase or principle at the expense of another is not

<sup>(6)</sup> American Journal of Sociology, Vol. XIV., p. 111.

saying that that is a special kind of sociology. No sociologist eliminates religion in his researches into social phenomena, but a materialist and skeptic is not likely to attribute the same value as a Christian. Every scientific investigator into the moral and cultural forces operating in and influencing human conduct weighs carefully the evidence furnished by Christian teaching, but leaves specific dogmas, doctrines and beliefs to the science to which they belong, theology. The religious sentiment of humanity, which is a resultant of human association, is of paramount importance in the study and investigation of social phenomena. It is an outgrowth of collective thought and personal experience. It recognizes dependence on some external, stronger and mightier power to which conformity of action is sought in order to obtain blessings and rewards. The occurrence of these phenomena on a large scale produces cults, creeds and institutions for worship. Therefore religion becomes a group interest and enters the domain of sociology. The entrance, however, does not justify the giving of a particular name to one phase of a particular science. The splitting up process would produce warring camps of sociologists and create a fac-simile of the "divided church." The terms Christian, Jew, Mohammedan, Brahminist, Buddhist, representing large groups and Catholic, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Methodist and Baptist, representing parts of one large group, are of incalculable value to theological dogmas, tenets and practices, but are only of value to sociology as representing a particular form of religious interest within the respective groups. Sociology studies man physically, psychically, spiritually and religiously, first, as an individual unit, then as a member of his group and then through the latter as a component part of human association in general; therefore it is one, not many, and can not be parcelled out among warring denominations or particular groups.

Having stated briefly what sociology is, the improvement in its method of research and investigation and pointed out the frequent and common misconceptions of the science, we direct our discussion to the "pulpit." We use this term in its widest sense, and include under it the complete scope of a pastor's activities in the group in which he labors. This includes his duties in the sanctuary, the preaching and teaching of the Word, in the

homes and associations of his parishioners, counseling, leading, guiding and directing social and religious living, and in the community, municipality, State or Nation, emphasizing and enforcing honesty, integrity and Christian morality in the administration of public interests. These activities are vitally connected with group life and are pre-eminently social. Religion. as a moral and cultural force, has always been a powerful cementing factor in human association. During centuries of growth and development it has by combination and recombination overleaped national boundaries and made its groups world wide. In its widest sense, therefore, the pulpit's mission is the employment of this saving moral socializing force to develop the highest social and religious life within the larger as well as the smaller groups. Second, in a narrower sense we use the term as a personality dealing with the individual rather than the group; with individual rather than social salvation; with individual rather than social environment and with private rather than public morality. We consider it as an agent to produce an uplifted elevated ennobled cultured and refined manhood and womanhood that will construct social groups of the highest type of Christian culture and morality; as the creator of a social conscience through the individual and as the messenger of the eternally true and right.

The institutions through which the pulpit largely performs its mission, both in the wider as well as in the narrower sense, are the Church and the family. Both are of ancient origin. They are fundamental and essentially vital for the perpetuity of group life. Through the former the spiritual and moral needs are supplied, through the latter they are translated into practical social living. Religious life is developed through the former, social life through the latter. Each is to produce the highest type of an individual for the group.

The pulpit's great storehouse of sociological material is the Bible. It is a mine of sociological as well as theological wealth. Shafts have been sunk by a few pioneers, but the extensive veins remain practically untouched. These lodes of divine wisdom must engage the attention of the pulpit before it undertakes to study the physical, vital and psychical laws and causes operating in modern demogenic association and apply remedial measures.

The message which is spoken from the sacred desk is drawn from the religious life and theology of a group providentially guided while surrounded by and in vital contact with other groups. The development of this group extends over centuries, the sociologic history of which shows how extensively the social life of the group is reflected in the progressive development of its theology. When the latter became international, it began a new development extending over nineteen centuries of social conflict. social life of the group which produced it must be studied by the historical method and carefully compared with contemporary groups in order to form a just estimate of the value of sociology to the pulpit and the extent to which it will enlarge its knowledge of the message as a life factor. For the purpose of discussion we shall make the following divisions: I. From the Beginnings to the Rise of Prophecy and the Establishment of the Monarchy; II. From the Rise of Prophecy and the Establishment of the Monarchy to the Beginning of Christ's Ministry; III. From the Beginning of Christ's Ministry to the Founding of the Christian Church; IV. From the Founding of the Christian Church to the Present, and V. Modern Demogenic Association.

 From the Beginnings to the Rise of Prophecy and the Establishment of the Monarchy.

The sociological material of the first few chapters of Genesis is fragmentary. Only a few facts are mentioned and these belong rather to the pre-historic than the historic stage of mankind. We find the primitive form of the family, of worship, of husbandry, of industry and of government in the family relationship. The primitiveness of the time coupled with the meagerness of information would make any description of their origin, nature and development sheer guess work, unless we introduced a state of knowledge foreign to the time.

The peopling of the world after the flood brings us into the historic period. At the threshold we find a fair form of tribal association with the domestic and religious institutions more definitely developed than the industrial and political. With rude instruments the ground was tilled a little, lodges for shelter constructed, skins of animals prepared for clothing and possibly some rough form of utensils manufactured for the preparation

of food. The domestication and propagation of animals that afforded a food supply was the principal occupation. With their flocks they roamed over the country in quest of subsistenence, which is always the first causative for social activity. Within the tribe the matriarchate prevailed; government was administered from the ancestral headquarters, which were usually at some central cluster of lodges called a "city," while religious worship was conducted by the sacrifice of the best of their flocks or possessions as a gift well-pleasing to God and securing His favor and blessing. Thought was primitive, language was undeveloped and writing existed only in the form of rude sketches of men, animals and other objects in significant attitudes on rocks and prepared tablets of stone or clay.

Everywhere among primitive groups this form of social orgamization existed. Under one or the other form of it the Hebrew people lived from Abraham to the rise of prophecy and the institution of the monarchy. During the life in Canaan, the sojourn in Egypt, the Wanderings in the Arabian Deserts, the Conquest of the Promised Land, and the development of a national feeling under the Judges, it sufficed for all public needs and was all that the mind could grasp. But changes came with time. The matriarchate became endogamous; political institutions crystalized; inventive talent appeared, more in warlike than peaceful pursuits, because the protection of the group was of prime concern, while religion received revelation from Yahwe who gave His Law to Moses on Mt. Sinai in the form of the "Ten Commandments," with instructions for the establishment of an elaborate ritualistic system of sacrifices and offerings and the setting apart of a tribe for its administration. Henceforth their religion showed a marked divergence from the other groups because of the introduction of the ethical idea of Yahwe. This idea. however, was practically beyond their powers of conception and reversion to the simpler Canaanitic forms was quite natural. Upon settlement in Canaan they mixed with the older civilization and imbibed many of its customs and practices. It was a case of either amalgamation or extermination. The safety of the people and the maintenance of their institutions demanded the latter and it was carried into execution mercilessly so far as was possible.

A sociological comparison shows a remarkable similarity of social life between the Hebrews on one side and all other people on the other. In legal and political institutions the Gentiles exceeded the Hebrews while in religious and domestic the opposite was true. Language among both was characterized by ellipticity and inaccuarcy of expression while laws, traditions and customs were handed down largely by mouth from generation to generation. This is characteristic of a child stage of civilization and in harmony with the social consciousness of that age. The Scripture records of Hebrew life and character confirm this because they describe every step of the process with remarkable clearness. On the other hand, with equal clarity they show their superior moral and religious development under the providential guidance of Yahwe and how divine principles, struggling against tremendous odds in the upward movement, overthrew the old, effete and worn out. Through their associated life under divine guidance, they gave to the world the exalted religious morality of Yahweism. In this brief survey of the period it was possible to touch upon only a few phases of Hebrew social life and development necessitating us to leave for the future the important question, "What were the social forces operating in such an age that could either produce a man who could write the Ten Commandments, or a people who could understand and appreciate their social significance?"(7)

II. From the Rise of Prophecy and the Establishment of the Monarchy to the Beginnings of Christ's Ministry.

During the latter portion of the period of the Judges, while harassed by neighboring tribes and in closer contact with the advancing powers of Babylon, Assyria and Egypt, a national feeling developed which broke across the tribal barrier and demanded a king. Sociologically and politically this was a necessary protective measure. They needed a mighty war chief for the defense of their social and religious institutions; national political ones they had none as yet worth mentioning. The majesty and dignity of the people must be represented by a giant of commanding stature, personality and prowess. A Judge and Prophet, concerned chiefly with religion and morality, was not

<sup>(7)</sup> Earp, Social aspects of Religious Institutions, p. 42.

fitted to rally the tribes for defense against mighty world-powers, and bowing meekly to the will of the people and obeying the divine command, he anointed Saul as king of all Israel. The upheavalwas complete and the second period of Hebrew sociology began. The organization and development of national political institutions fell to the new king; the administration of the sanctuary sacrifices and offerings to the Priests, and a new order created called "Prophetism," which became the preacher of private and public morality. Yahwe became the national God and His religion the national religion.

The maintenance of a national righteousness acceptable to-Yahwe, without which there was no hope for national success, soon became a burning question. Hebrew life and character, laws and customs now came in contact with foreign nations through the channels of commercial and diplomatic intercourse which opened the way for the introduction of the vices, immoralities and deceptions incident to courts and statecraft. This intercourse also brought foreign customs and manners together with foreign gods and their religious rites and practices. appealed to their comparatively primitive minds, and threatened to annihilate the worship of Yahwe. The matriarchate gave way to the patriarchate, deities were masculinized and women dethroned. In vain did the voice of prophecy call, first to the nation, and then to the individual, to bring social and national ideas into harmony with Yahweism and avert the threatened doom. But the appeals went unheeded, and first the Northern and then the Southern Kingdom fell, and Israel went captive to Babylon and Assyria. The high social, ethical and religious ideals preached by the prophets were practically beyond the grasp of the social mind. Consequently, it succumbed before the lower with direful results.

A mongrel population was settled in Canaan. The remnant that returned brought with it Babylonian and Assyrian social life. Distinctly Hebrew social institutions perished with the exile. Those that survived were so modified by those of contemporary society that they were almost unrecognizable. The religious, however, survived, though not higher in type than formerly. They manifested a stability which the coming of the

Roman Eagles, Roman Law, Customs, Deities, Agnation and the "Patria Potestas" could not overthrow.

The survival of the religious institution of Yahweism in the face of almost insurmountable obstacles is the most unique fact in Hebrew and Biblical Sociology and History. It was the highest "expression of the relationship between God and man" that the world knew. It was the indestructible bond that bore them through centuries of cataclysmic changes socially, religiously and civilly. It was the maintaining and cherishing of its high social ideals that enabled the Hebrew people to develop that exalted religious life which gave the world the Messiah.

III... From the Beginning of Christ's Ministry to the Founding of the Christian Church.

Christ was the greatest social and religious teacher the world ever knew. The view of the Father which He gave to the world was entirely new. It was not a new Jehovah, but a new view of, and relationship to Him. He came not to destroy but to fulfill, to erect a new social and religious structure upon the foundations which the Father had laid through the Hebrew people. The keynote of the structure was love, the greatest society making force in the world. Righteous conduct and social goodness were placed above the observance of ritual. Consequently the effete ceremonial law was annulled and a new one of social service, based on love and equality, substituted. The Kingdom of God was to be established on earth from which coercion, exploitation and inequality were to be banished. The old dividing line between Jew and Gentile disappeared and a new one arose between good and evil. These far-reaching social changes meant nothing but trouble for their author.

When Jesus began His social and religious reform work, Judea was quite thoroughly Romanized. Consequently it was not possible for Him to attack openly Rome's domestic, religious and political institutions as He did those of His own people, and His sociology in this respect is fragmentary. Rome was indifferent to other religions and other social institutions so long as they did not conflict nor interfere with her own. The Priestly Party, being the conservative party among the Jews, was equally indifferent so long as there was no invasion of its rights and prerogatives. The preaching of a new social order that eliminated co-

ercion, exploitation and inequality did not sound pleasing to Roman ears. The enunciation of the new relation between Himself and the Father brought Him into open conflict with the ruling party of His own people. He averted an open conflict with Rome, but fell a victim to the latter, not, however, until He had given the new social order to the world.

The bulk of His social teaching is contained in His famous Sermon on the Mount and the Parables. All through the Gospels are scattered fragments, however, which must be assembled, arranged and classified for any systematic presentation of His teaching. Sociology has studied this portion of the "Sacred Book" more thoroughly than any other and embodied the results in concrete form. It represents scientific sociology's interpretation of the social ideals of the mind of Jesus, and is presented to the pulpit in the hope that it will advance the cause of social salvation.

IV. From the Founding of the Christian Church to the Present.

The Advent of the Holy Spirit marks the beginning of the application of Christ's sociology and theology to social and individual salvation. That the Jewish Priestly Party should persecute the new order was perfectly natural because the latter's triumph would mean the former's extinction. It was equally self-evident that Rome would resort to persecution as soon as its order was menaced, When Paul wrote his epistles, in order to avoid conflict and persecution and mitigate their severity as much as possible in case they should come, he wrote much about the duties of servants to their masters. At this time there were three sets of social institutions engaged in a life and death struggle: Imperial Roman, Priestly Jewish and the Infant Christian, the new order of Jesus. In this sociological conflict the Jewish had sufficient tenacity, tradition and national pride to maintain itself in a minor way, while the Roman, senile and weakened by years of luxury and vice, gradually gave way before the young and more virile Christian, not, however, before it had taught the latter organization. Instead of developing Christ's new social order and putting into practice His ideals, the latter adopted the Roman organization and adapted Christian ideals to it as far as possible. Consequently, social equality and social salvation were buried completely for centuries in ecclesiastical rights and prerogatives.

However, beneath these strata of prerogatives seeped the teachings of Jesus, but it was not until the time of the German Reformation, championed by Luther, that the idea of social salvation was able to break through the fissures of corruption. However, when the Peasants rose to escape from the heels of feudalism and class privilege and to join in the movement for social equality and salvation, no leader was to be found, and it disappeared as quickly as it appeared.

It remained for the hardy pioneers who established the infant republic in this western hemisphere to give the world the best example of Christ's new social order, "That two men are equal, not because they have equal claims upon each other, but because they owe equal duties to each other." But the natural tendency of equality is toward inequality, and soon an aristocracy of wealth began to take the place of an aristocracy of privilege and prerogative. Social salvation ebbed before the new "moneyking" but only to rise again in the "New Revival of Social Learning." In this it seeks the realization of Christ's love in a complete life "that springs from a sense of brotherhood," and finds that life is more than the meat and raiment of a precarious existence. Its ideal is the Kingdom of God on earth—social weal and religious weal—fraternity and equality.

## V. Modern Demogenic Society.

A few words on this will suffice for the present. Modern Society is exceedingly complex. For a number of years scientific scholars have been engaged in extensive researches into its structure and life. The study of the physical planes and currents of the social mind and conscience operative in the formation of public opinion, conventionality, imitation and conflict has yielded excellent results. Standards of living, including food, clothing, housing, sanitation, employment, education, amusement, and recreation; the care and training of children; the sick; the aged; the infirm; the defectives and the delinquents have all received extensive study and investigation. A vast body of valuable literature including books, periodicals, pamphlets, etc., has been the result of this activity. More or less of this is accessible in every good library, and affords an excellent opportunity for the pulpit

to familiarize itself with sociological research and social progress. That pulpit which desires to discharge its mission with a view to the realization of the highest state of Christian living on the widest scale possible can not afford to neglect it.

This survey of the sociological material furnished by the Bible and contemporary society brings to light a number of important facts which deserve careful study by the pulpit. It shows, first, that both sociology and the pulpit deal with the phenomena of human association; the one in a general way, the other in a specific and for a specific purpose. Both also have the same aim, the betterment of human society. In the Bible we find the sociological and the religious either on parallel lines, or else closely interwoven, so that often the one can not be considered apart from the other. Religious worship has always been largely social. The great Hebrew festivals were the general social assemblages of the tribes in which worship was an important factor. Their religion was the cementing force by which they were solidified into a larger social group of national character.

In comparing the Hebrew group with the other contemporary groups, a marked similarity is revealed. This is due to the fact that both were primitive societies. Being more or less in social contact they absorbed each other's social institutions to a marked degree. But this, instead of decreasing, increases the value of Scripture, because the social institutions which it describes are true to the life and civilization of the day. The infiltration of foreign social and religious ideas produced changes that finally bore down for a time the stronger social and religious cult. This, however, was only temporary. In less than a century it reappeared with increased vitality, fostered by a new generation that knew not the former Joseph. Its pertinacity and esoterism carried it through many changes until the Advent of Christ. Yahweism, therefore, was a social product of the Hebrew group for whose clear interpretation and application sociological study is very valuable.

Christ introduced the "Gospel of Love" and the "Spirit of Brotherhood." Individual righteousness and salvation was subordinated to social. To many this order was revolutionary. That a wholesome environment was requisite for the sustentation of individual salvation was unintelligible to the mind of that day. When the disciples began the construction of society upon the basis of the new Social Order, they came into collision with the artificially created classes of Roman society. Being few in numbers and weak, they abandoned the social and took up the individual. When Rome in turn became subject to the Church, the latter adopted the Roman order and failed to resume the social. With the exception of a rift in the clouds at long intervals, the social remained obscured until the "New Revival of Social Learning."

The latter has unfolded the nature and complexity of the phenomena of modern human association. The processes of these phenomena are physical, psychical and religious. They are controlled by specific laws and governed by specific causes. Psychical planes and currents are active everywhere in developing uniformities of feeling, belief and volition due to social causes. As a result, a multitude of problems, some many-sided, arise; opportunities for the application of Christ's social Gospel present themselves, and the question of modern demogenic association becomes one not of opportunity, but of means and ability to meet the opportunities successfully. Will the pulpit meet them fairly and squarely with the social message of God's Word? Christ's idea of the Father, and His social and religious doctrines, are fully adequate to meet all the opportunities that may be presented.

Scientifically trained men and women are needed to direct intelligently the work of social salvation. Here sociology and the pulpit become one. The pulpit that truly interprets the social teaching of Jesus must in a measure be—sociologist. The Church and the pulpit have done much to bind up the wounds, breathe forgiveness and solace the victims of bad social conditions, but very little in hewing to the base—the policing and lighting of the Jerico road. Sociology appeals to the pulpit for assistance in devising an efficient system of policing and lighting the road so as to make it impossible for travelers to fall under the infesting thieves and robbers—bad social conditions.

Our study shows that the social and the religious are intimately related and closely interwoven in the development of the plan of salvation. That Christ's salvation is individual and social. That

during twenty centuries of social conflict, social salvation was obscured by artificially created classes. That there is no more efficient means for achieving social regeneration than that of which the pulpit possesses the leverage—the Gospel of Christ.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

P. S.—We append the following bibliography for the general reader who may desire to study the subject further:

Mathews, The Social Teaching of Jesus.
Peabody, Jesus Christ and the Social Question.
Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis.
Earp, Social Aspects of Religious Institutions.
Ely, Social Aspects of Christianity.

Nash, Genesis of the Social Conscience.

# ARTICLE X.

# REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

The Precinct of Religion. By C. Gray Shaw. \$2.00.

The preface tells us that the "substance of the lectures was delivered in the Graduate School of New York University in the course entitled, Philosophy of Religion." He says, furthermore, "both metaphysics and psychology are here set aside for the sake of a humanism which seems best adapted to defining the essence of human worship." But humanism is an important term in philosophy and he nowhere defines it. His meaning of the term—and he uses it rather loosely—would add very materially to the perspicuity of the book. The style is smooth and the book very readable.

The divisions are: The Essence of Religion; The Character of Religion; The Reality of Religion; The Religious World-

order; under each of which there are four chapters.

Under the Essence of Religion we find the author largely in harmony with that trend of present-day thought which refuses to recognize the transcendental. "It is when man awakens to his human destiny, that the perplexity and pain arise. In this way all religion is humanistic" (82). Religion grows out of human perplexity and pain against which human consciousness exercises its self-assertion. "The result of this self-affirmation will be seen to involve the whole of human spiritual life" (71).

Under the character and reality of religion he contends for a positivistic view. "To be convinced that religion did have a beginning, and that it has had a development, is no small gain in a philosophy which regards time as subjective, and we have only begun to see what these genetic principles mean" (161). Man has learned to reverence the World-soul. "The ideal history of humanity appears in the real history of mankind, and just as humanity is above the particularities of time and space, person and circumstance, so humanity hastens on to the domain of Absolute Life. It is by such reasoning that religion realizes itself; and when we see that over man is humanity, it will appear that above this is the world-order which barely falls short of the Godhead" (262).

The present "humanistic" trend in the philosophy of religion is beautifully set forth in this volume, but just because of its humanism it is far from an adequate presentation of religion.

The humanistic emphasis has its justification only against the over-emphasis of the transcendent and supernatural; it must not presume to usurpation where equity only is allowed.

C. F. SANDERS.

The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life. By Henry Churchill King. \$1.50.

This volume from the facile pen of the President of Oberlin College "aims to face, as straightforwardly as possible, the problem implied in its title." A portion of the material here used, he tells us, has been given in several Summer School lecture courses.

The central question of the book is thus expressed, "Why can we not see God?" One supreme difficulty lies in the fact that we are so accustomed to body that we lose sight of the presentations of pure mind. Some attention to the influence of mind over body will effect a change here.

Another difficulty lies in the usual divorcement of philosophy, as commonly taught, from revelation. The usefulness of the inquiry into what we can know of God and reality apart from revelation is not to be minimized, but on the other hand it becomes pernicious in case it blinds us to such "very significant and indubitable facts as Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Jesus." If the thinker honestly takes account of his self-imposed restriction of field he may perhaps account for "the Seeming Unreality of the Spirit—ual."

The Spiritual Life is without strain, calm. The whole meaning of his (Jesus') life seems to say, "God can be counted upon. The life in relation to him is no mere imaginary one, which you are forced to make; it is a real life in which he is constantly at work. I am come to give you the most positive assurance upon that point."

The spiritual life is not mere imitation, not a life by magical inheritance, nor of external rules. "We are called to liberty." "Perhaps the greatest source of the seeming unreality of the spiritual life is the simple failure to fulfil its natural conditions."

The profound arguments for theism frequently miss their purpose by directing attention to the formal force of dialectic rather than the vital faith behind them. Spiritual fellowship transcends logic and beggars expression in dialectic form. We will see more of God's reality when we remember that our theistic dialectic is but the poor expression of the sublime fact of spirit's believing apprehension of absolute Spirit.

Quoting Paulsen's Introduction to Philosophy as follows: "I could not live, I could not breathe and move freely in a world that is nothing but an enormous, senseless and soulless machine;

hence I cannot believe that it is such a machine; hence I believe that it is the revelation of an all-wise and all-good God, even though my eyes fail to see him and my understanding comprehend him not." The process of knowledge rests upon explication of our intuitive insight, and even "Mathematics depends upon the certainty of intuitive insight at every step,..... we do not prove and then see." The moral intuition of God should not be accounted less certain.

The book is, like everything from this author, brilliant and popular. It abounds in fine passages and keen discernments. It is very suggestive. It is not a profound construction of the reality of the Spiritual Life, rather a happy statement of the undeniable facts which imply it. This is its value. We commend

it.

C. F. SANDERS.

India: Its Life and Thought. By John P. Jones, D.D. Pp. XVII, 448. \$2.50.

India, with an area of one and a half million square miles, with a population of 300,000,000, forming not a coherent nationality, but divided by race, by language, by religion, and by caste, with a unique civilization that has been four thousand years in the making, together with its life and thought, furnishes a large and difficult theme. He who would present it in a single volume undertakes a tremendous task. The author's preparation for this work has been a residence of thirty years among these people as an earnest missionary. What he has to say, therefore, is largely the result of experience and observation. In addition he has sought to acquaint himself with the literature embodying the faiths and philosophies of these interesting Orientals. Yet the author is modest about his qualification. He makes no loud claim to a right to speak and to be heard. We listen to him the more willingly for this attitude.

Rapidly and comprehensively we are given a view of "India's Present Unrest," "Its Many Faiths," "Its Caste System," "The Hindu Bible," "Popular Hinduism," "Hindu Religious Ideals," "Home Life of the Hindus," "India's Pessimism," "Islam in India," "The Christ and the Buddha," "Modern Religious Move-

ments," "The Progress of Christianity in India."

This bare outline of subjects treated must suffice to give an idea of the ground covered. The point of view is that of a Christian missionary, and the motive that impels his pen is "to bring face to face with the immense and intricate problems involved all those who desire to know, to help and to bless India." The discussions are informing, and as full as space will allow.

India presents one of the largest and most important fields for

Christian evangelization. It is receiving a fair share of the foreign missionary interest and effort of the Christian Church of this country. Any one therefore, who can by voice or pen give us a more intelligent conception of the needs, the difficulties, the opportunities, and the possibilities of this vast field, deserves a ready and wide hearing. We trust the book will have a large sale. We can particularly commend it to our own pastors and people. Dr. Jones has labored in South India, not very remotely from our own field. What he has to say, therefore, applies quite well to conditions with which we have to do, and is practically as helpful to us as if it were from the pen of one of our own missionaries.

L. K.

The Bible for Home and School. Acts, The Second Volume of Luke's Work on the Beginnings of Christianity, with Interpretative Comment by George Holley Gilbert, Ph.D., D.D. Cloth. Pp. 267. Price 75 cents net.

We can but repeat our former hearty commendation of the series, The Bible For Home and School. It is just what the average layman and Sunday School teacher wants. The volume on Acts is a multum in parvo, brief, sensible and to the point. Dr. Gilbert is free from dogmatic bias. His interpretation is simple and illuminating.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

#### FUNK & WAGNALLS CO. NEW YORK.

The World's Great Sermons. Compiled by Grenville Kleiser, formerly of Yale Divinity School Faculty, author of "How to Speak in Public," etc. Introduction by Lewis O. Brastow, D.D., Professor Emeritus of Practical Theology in Yale University. Ten volumes. Cloth, four by six inches.

These little volumes printed in large type on good paper and neatly bound, are offered at a nominal price for the entire set as a premium with the *Homiletic Review*. They illustrate the enterprise of the publishers, who thus again put the clergy under bonds of gratitude.

The collection of over one hundred sermons from Basil in the Fourth Century to Hillis and Jowett in the Twentieth is varied and comprehensive. No one is represented by more than a single sermon. We are impressed by the good judgment of the compiler.

These sermons, thus gathered and grouped, are valuable in

19097

showing us the style and point of view of great men through the ages. They are full of power and inspiration. They show, however, that each age needs its own peculiar preaching. We commend these volumes as instructive and stimulating. They will suggest scores of stirring themes and sermons to the live preacher.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

#### CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

The Logical and Historical Inaccuracies of the Hon. Bourke Cockran in his review of the Lutheran Letter of Protest to President Roosevelt. By Prof. W. H. T. Dau. Paper. Pp. 40. Price 10 cents.

This pamphlet is an echo resulting from the protest of certain Lutheran pastors against President Roosevelt's ill-considered remarks in reference to voting for Roman Catholic candidates for public office. The Hon. Bourke Cockran of New York, in an address before the First American Catholic Missionary Conference held at Chicago, endeavored to justify the attitude of President Roosevelt and to answer the charge brought in the Lutheran letter. Prof. Dau shows up Mr. Cockran's utter incompetency to deal with the question, both from his lack of fairness and of knowledge. The Lutheran letter, charging the Roman Catholic Church in her offensive utterances with maintaining the un-American and un-Democratic dogma of the union of Church and State remains unanswered anl unanswerable. The pamphlet serves a useful purpose and is ably written.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

#### EATON & MAINS. NEW YORK.

Lincoln's Use of the Bible...By S. Trevena Jackson...Paper. Embossed cover. Pp. 35. Price 25 cents net.

This beautiful booklet was opportunely issued in time for the Lincoln centenary. It recalls his remarkable acquaintance with the Bible as evidenced by his public utterances and his simple, graphic English. No President of the United Stats was more influenced by the Bible than he. It was to him the Word of God. "It mastered his manners, molded his mind, made mighty his manhood, and gave to America the matchless man." Without the advantages of a thorough school-education Lincoln was largely self-taught and his principal teacher was the Book of Books.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

## FLEMING H. REVELL CO. NEW YORK.

The New Horoscope of Missions. By James S. Dennis, D.D., Author of "Christian Missions and Social Progress," etc. Lectures delivered at McCormick Theological Seminary on the John H. Converse Foundation. Cloth. Pp. 248. Price \$1.00 net.

Dr. Dennis is an authority on Christian missions and always writes in an interesting and instructive manner. The Lectures comprised in the above volume deserve the larger audience which the press is providing. The comprehensive knowledge and the skill of the author have enabled him to marshal great facts in a most convincing manner, giving an enlarged missionary outlook. "A new world-consciousness" has come into being among nations and in the Church. The human race is becoming aware of its possibilities. The value of the mission factor is being recognized. "The Stragetic Aspects" of missions appear in the new opportunities in the awakening nations and in the strong place that missionaries have won by their diligence and usefulness. The progress of the kingdom is evident in the large additions to membership in heathen lands and in their great influence.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

#### CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

The Heroes and Crises of Early Hebrew History From the Creation to the Death of Moses. By Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University. With Maps. (1908. Pp. xvi., 251).

This work forms the first volume in a series of six, entitled "The Historical Bible." It begins with an introduction discussing The Old Testament World, The Babylonian background of early Hebrew history, The Egyptian and Palestinian background, Israel's religious heritage, The oldest history of Israel, and Later parallel histories. The era between creation and the death of Moses is then taken up and considered under four heads: The beginnings of human history, Traditional ancestors of the Hebrews, The bondage and deliverance from Egypt, The Hebrews in the wilderness east of the Jordan. Three appendices follow setting forth the late priestly story of creation, registering the bibliography of a practical biblical reference library, and listing general questions and subjects for special research.

The defects noted in a former criticism of volume ix, in "The Historical Series for Bible Students," edited by Professors Kent and Sanders (Luth. Quarterly 1907, 592 f.), have, in a large measure, repeated themselves in the book before us. The standpoint of the author is that of the theological Left, in whose midst he should be considered fairly conservative. But so many of his claims are mere projections which lack historical support. The Introduction is interesting and very instructive, giving the book its special value. The maps and appendices are commendable in more ways than one. And in the real corpus of the book the archaelogical notices are very helpful to the average student. But the exegetical facts often fall flat. Where they differ from the traditional commentaries, they appear dry, spiritless, tiresome, leaving the reader rather indifferent in places where they should call forth a challenge. The book has succeeded remarkably well in conserving the weaker positions of the older commentaries. Why should it be necessary to make Adam worse than he was? Why should the words, "She gave me from the tree and I ate," be considered as necessarily meaning that Adam blamed Eve? It is at least just as likely that Adam was sincere in his confession and felt himself no less guilty than if he had himself been the first one to take of the fruit. Some modern conservative commentators take this view, and why should the ultra-modern be more backward in psychology than in philology?

The time is not yet ripe for putting Professor Kent's book into the hands of undergraduates; for the alleged results that he tabulates, in cutting up the text to suit arbitrary efforts of reconstructions, will not hold their own. We have still a Klostermann to reckon with. And as long as men like Strack of Berlin, Buhl of Copenhagen, Kittel of Leipzig, are combating the "results" put forth by Wellhausen, Gunkel, and Guthe, there is no fear that the compilations of Prof. Kent will claim the field. Notwithstanding, the book has its good sides. The paragraphs, "Historical Significance of the Story" and "Aim and Teaching," which accompany the various sections as a part of the comment to the text, are by no means trifles. We question, however, if these paragraphs would not have looked otherwise if the author had never received the benefits of despised orthodox schooling. Ministers will read Kent's booklet with some degree of profit and use it, possibly, to good advantage in their work with catechetical classes. I doubt, though, that it will prove to be of value when put into the hands of immature pupils. Blaikie and Edersheim may be, and are in many things, far from being up-to-date; but the positive factors of these works, viewed from

the ethico-religious standpoint, far outweigh the results obtained from the perusal of the reconstruction attempted by Professor Kent.

The typographical phase of the work is most excellent.

JOHN O. EVJEN.

The Founders and Rulers of United Israel From the Death of Moses to the Division of the Hebrew Kingdom. By Charles Foster Kent....With Maps and Plans. (...1908. Pp. xii., 238.)

We have here the second volume of "The Historical Bible." It is really a continuation of the first, which covers thirty sections. This volume then begins with Sec. xxx1, closing with Sec. lx, thus of uniform size with the first. The main headings are: The settlement and conquest of Canaan, The founding of the Hebrew kingdom, The decline of Saul and the rise of David, The political events of David's reign, The splendors of Solomon's reign. Two appendices are added, corresponding to the second and third in the first volume; besides this, the work contains two maps, not above the medicore, and two plans of Solomon's temple, taken from Stade.

This work, covering a period dealing with concrete facts, does not leave much room for those who are on the lookout for myth and legend. But here,too, the legend-label has been gummed and affixed when it was not necessary. On the whole, the spirit in this volume is much the same as that in the former one. The merits and defects call for no additional comment. The translations of the text—for the author does not follow any official version—will be welcomed by all lovers of simple, robust English.

JOHN O. EVJEN.

